THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1938 NUMBER 1215

Spain's Naval Victory

The naval battle in which the Spanish Loyalists torpedoed and sank the flagship of the Rebel fleet was a victory worth the capture of three or four towns on land. This war, like so many others in the past, bids fair to be won or lost on the basis of naval supremacy. Now that the government has a large and well disciplined army, together with plenty of trained fliers and technicians, it is not so fearful as in the past of Italian or German "volunteers" with Franco. It is afraid, however, of Franco's superiority in equipment, and especially in artillery and planes. Franco can continue or even enlarge this superiority if he can keep on receiving supplies from abroad, while interfering with foreign shipments to Barcelona. So far he has been somewhat hampered in the latter half of his task by the fact that he cannot establish a legal blockade, since he does not have the status of a recognized belligerent. But the pending negotiations between Italy and Britain may give him such a status. If the government navy can establish its superiority, however, Franco cannot maintain an effective blockade, in any case. A few more such victories might give the Loyalists themselves power to interrupt the flow of equipment to the Rebels. In that case the government could solve by its own power the vexed question of intervention.

Poor Man's Insurance

Governor Lehman has repeated his endorsement of the savings-bank life-insurance bill which is being considered by the New York State Legislature. The bill would permit savings banks to sell life-insurance policies of $1,000 or less and thereby save an enormous amount of money for the poor who are at present buying industrial insurance from private companies. We know this because the plan has been tested and proved successful in Massachusetts during the past thirty years. The savings banks can sell policies at lower net cost and offer better terms largely because they do not have to spend a large percentage of their income on commissions to an army of high-pressure salesmen. Several recent studies of industrial insurance in New York have shown how much waste is involved in the present method of selling policies. Lapses are frequent, cost is excessive and the unceasing efforts of the insurance agents beguile investors into buying all kinds of policies which they do not really want and cannot afford. Strong opposition to the bill of course comes from the huge private insurance companies which are well satisfied with things as they are. On a single day 10,000 telegrams poured into Albany from agents who, by a mysterious coincidence, all got the same idea at the same time. If the bill is defeated there will be no doubt about who is responsible and why.

The Reorganization Quarrel

Most citizens will be puzzled by the fight in Congress about the bill for reorganization of the executive agencies. For years—ever since the administration of President Taft—governmental reorganization to obtain greater efficiency has been a perennial suggestion. But for years Congress has either shown no interest or has blocked the recommended measures. Regardless of the

CONTENTS

The Week 149

Editorials

Moscow Loses Caste 151
Trouble in the TVA 152

General Articles

Which Way Canada? . . . Maxwell Cohen 154
What Next? . . . . . Bruce Bliven 157
Maxims and Anecdotes: II . Kenneth Burke 159
Shoot the Works . . . . Heywood Broun 161
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 162
Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 163
Surprising Confirmations . . Stark Young 164
Film-Goers' Grab Bag . . Otis Ferguson 165
The Bandwagon 166
A Communication . . . Maurice Hindus 166

Correspondence 167

Books in Review

The Golden Legend . . Malcolm Cowley 170
Napoleon in the Clinic . Solomon F. Bloom 171
Farm on the Equator . . Richard Vaughan 172
Why China Fights . . Ernest O. Hauser 172
A Counter to Confusion . J. G. Crowther 173
Dodd on Democracy . Robert Morss Lovett 173
Books in Brief 174
New Books: A Reader's List 175

Entered as Second Class matter, November 6, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merits of the specific proposals in the present bill, the same attitude is being manifested again. The reason is simple—and political. Congressmen like to keep power over the number of employees in the various bureaus, and over the appropriations given them, in order to enhance their control over patronage. Any general reshuffling of bureaus and commissions runs athwart the vested interests of many Congressmen. Individual bureaus and departments which jealously guard their own preserves stimulate congressional resistance. No such plan will ever be put through unless the President is given authority to do it without the intervention of Congress on matters of detail. Congress is now being asked to give the President just that power. Congressmen protest that this is fascism, or executive usurpation, and the same group who fought against Supreme Court reform is now mobilized to battle against the existing bill. But the real reason is protection of political fences. We wish the proposal might be debated on its merits, because it might be improved by such debate. But it is likely to be defeated or passed in amended form simply on the basis of log-rolling.

Miscarriage of North Carolina Justice

In 1929, the Gastonia case was a *cause célèbre* in the United States. A chief of police and a gang of tough deputies invaded a union meeting; there was a fight, and the chief of police was killed. A group of union men were tried for murder and, after a mistrial, some of them were tried again, this time for conspiracy to commit murder. The trials were conducted in an atmosphere highly prejudicial to justice. At one time, a murderous mob went hunting for the defense attorneys with the obvious intention of lynching them. In the courtroom, the defendants were all described as Communists, which at that time in North Carolina was rather worse than saying they were lepers. The judge instructed the jury that it could disregard the testimony of anyone who admitted being without religious conviction. Its members, with characteristic backwoods mentality, found the defendants guilty of second-degree murder without a scrap of evidence against them.

The case was appealed to a higher court, and the defendants were released on bail. Facing the likelihood that they would get no more justice in one court than another, they jumped bail and disappeared. One of them, Fred Beal, has now been recaptured and is confronted with the necessity of serving a twenty-year sentence. Beal is, or was, a Communist, and at his trial he received the warm support of the Communist Party. In the past eight years, however, he has gone to Russia, did not like conditions there, and returned to the United States to write a sensational series of articles in the Hearst newspapers, and a book excoriating the Soviet Union and all its ways. As a result, the American Communists are no longer interested in helping him, and his friends say they are actually opposing his further defense. But disliking Soviet Russia is not a crime for which a man should serve twenty years in a North Carolina prison. The only questions at issue are whether Beal conspired to murder the chief of police, and had a fair trial. Conspiracy seems impossible, since the men in the meeting did not know they were to be raided. On the second point, the answer is No. If he is forced to serve out his sentence, a miscarriage of justice will be seen that entirely parallels the cases of Sacco and Vanzetti, Mooney and Billings.

Mr. Hudler Makes a List

We wish to acknowledge a friendly hail from the Noblesville, Indiana, Morning Times. Mr. Daily Hudler, the publisher, is looking for the names of people who make speeches, and asks if we will jot down ten or a dozen such, from our community. Dear Mr. Hudler, you don't know the half of it. It would be easier to supply you with 10,000, from our community, than with ten. Ours is the town where they take a microphone out on the street, stop people at random, and get fifty polished and professional orations in a night. Everybody we know has a lecture agent and a little circular about himself in which he gives five different and spicy titles for the same old lecture (the one with the joke). There are so many lecturers and so few listeners here that nobody would ever get an audience except that fellow practitioners of the art come to take notes on technique. . . . Reading Mr. Hudler's letter again, we suddenly perceive possible sinister overtones. Is he, by any chance, the Pied Piper of Lecturers? Is he assembling that list because he has heard a lecture, and proposes a pogrom? If so, let him write to us again. We are sure we can get together.

It Never Happened

Many people in the United States want this country to halt Japan by means of an official government embargo on trade with her. To support this view, a story is in circulation saying that once before, the United States did exactly this. After the Great War, Japan occupied a large part of eastern Siberia for several years and resisted all efforts to get her out. According to this tale, the United States notified the Japanese that unless the troops were withdrawn, no more exports of steel from America to their country would be permitted. Since Japan badly needed American steel for shipbuilding, munitions and other purposes, this threat was effective. The troops were withdrawn, the embargo was not put into operation. It is a pretty story, and the only thing wrong is that it is not true. The American State Department, of which we have inquired, has no record of any such thing. It has, moreover, half a dozen other good reasons why Japan got

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of Siberia when she did. Confirmation of the denial comes from Bernard M. Baruch, former chairman of the War Industries Board, who would certainly know about it if the tale were true.

Professions Support the WPA

In New York City recently a Conference of Professions was held to consider a desirable policy for the WPA. Those who attended were either independent specialists or representatives sent by recognized professional organizations—without power to commit those organizations. Four panels discussed and endorsed conclusions—one each on Public Health, Education, the Arts, and Economics and Social Planning. The chairmen of these panels were, respectively, Dr. A. A. Brill, Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild, Mr. Walter Pach and Mr. George Soule. The conclusions exhibited a remarkable degree of agreement. All praised the excellent work done by the WPA in the past and urged its continuation and extension. Immediate expansion was urged in view of the present unemployment emergency. At the same time, certain improvements were visualized, looking in the direction of a permanent relief policy. The needs test was condemned. The continuing necessity of useful public undertakings was emphasized. It was recommended that these be based on a long-time plan.

News Notes of a Week

England and Italy this week prepared for the forthcoming negotiations for which the whole world was waiting with such anxiety. . . . In China, neither side gained decisive advantage during the week ending March 8. The Japanese claimed control of nearly all Shansi Province. From Tokyo came reports of increasing alarm over the stubbornness of Chinese resistance and Japan's precarious financial and economic position. . . . Aerial bombing was used by the British against the Arabs in Palestine. . . . A serious cause of international tension seemed likely to be removed when Japan indicated she would suspend salmon-fishing operations off the Alaskan coast. . . . Hungary moved to settle her war debt with the United States by paying the principal but no interest. American pacifists objected on the ground that Hungary could then raise new loans in the United States for military purposes.

At home, Congress continued to struggle with the tax bill. It refused to give the President badly needed authority to veto individual items in an otherwise acceptable measure. . . . Mr. Roosevelt claimed two more small islands in mid-Pacific, useful in trans-oceanic air service. One of these, it is said, was claimed and occupied by New Zealand six months ago. . . . A storm raged around the President's sale of some of his writings, and stenographic transcripts of press conferences, for publication. . . . A trade agreement was signed with Czechoslovakia.

Moscow Loses Caste

THE TRIAL AT MOSCOW presents the usual bewildering picture of inherently incredible charges against a large number of men of the first rank in the Soviet government, charges bolstered by confessions which, because of their apparent sincerity and detail, it is almost impossible not to believe. The spectator in the outside world is left suspended between these two poles of incredibility. Those who have strong emotional responses toward the Soviets will naturally choose one or the other extreme, not on the basis of judgment but on that of blind loyalty, positive or negative. What is left for the rest of us? At the moment, merely guesses and general observations.

Our guess is that neither the Trotskyists nor the Stalinists are completely right about the guilt of the accused. Most of them are probably guilty of something, though not of the extremes of treachery that the indictment charges. Undoubtedly there was a widespread opposition in high places to Stalin, and one that may be traced back in many cases to the time of Lenin's death. Undoubtedly also there were from the start a few real spies and traitors. That spying and internal sabotage have increased markedly during the recent years of crisis and threatened war there can be little question. It is also quite possible that sincere Bolsheviks, once they became antagonistic to the regime, were driven further and further into intrigue and questionable associations, merely because no open opposition was possible appealing for popular support under any real form of democracy. But it can scarcely be true that so many prominent and trusted persons were out-and-out conspirators for fascism or the return of capitalism or the handing out of territory to foreign enemies. It is a strain on credulity to assert that they planned so many murders, poisonings or massacres.

Whatever the truth concerning the defendants may be, it is an obvious fact that hardly anything more disastrous to Soviet prestige in the rest of the world can be imagined. The effect of the repeated trials and executions is incalculably great. They came just as large areas of public opinion in Europe, America and Asia were becoming more warmly sympathetic with the aims and achievements of Russian socialism. The communist tactics of coöperation with democratic and popular movements everywhere seemed to argue an increase of common sense in the Kremlin. Fear of the Soviet Union was waning rapidly. The terror, we were beginning to believe, was a thing of the past; at long length the Russians were developing toward democracy. But the trials have revealed the Tartar beneath the skin of the Russian; they have presented us with a dramatic exhibition of what is, to the Western mind, complete incomprehensibility—regardless of who is in the right. The effect is equally frightening

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

either way. People who can behave like this are simply outside our realm of discourse.

The trials and purges have of course disrupted and disheartened the movements on the left; but more than that, they have sent a chill over every suggestion of faith in, and coöperation with, the Stalin regime. It is quite within the realm of possibility that in England Prime Minister Chamberlain would not have been able to take his present turn in international affairs if the trials had not occurred. The moral effect on the French popular front and on the seriousness with which the Franco-Soviet alliance is taken has already been bad, and the end is not yet. In the United States any concrete proposal of coöperation with the Soviet Union, difficult as it would have been at any time, is now sure to be buried under popular disapproval.

It may be replied that this cooling of confidence is unjustified by the facts, since in reality the Soviet regime is strengthened by the discovery and elimination of its internal enemies. But the lesson of history would seem to be quite the contrary. Arbitrary and dictatorial regimes which for so long have to keep purging themselves of prominent internal opponents seem to encourage more and more dangerous opposition. It is probable that the Soviet government would have been much stronger today, both internally and in international prestige, if it had moved more rapidly toward democracy in politics and civil liberty in press, speech and the administration of justice. Opponents who doubted the wisdom of specific policies could have appealed for popular support instead of being driven to conspiratorial methods. It is doubtful whether any group that really wanted to restore capitalism or betray the country in some other way could have made much headway in the interplay of democratic debate. Plots and counterplots, with their unwholesome atmosphere of secrecy and fear, would have been more difficult to manage.

The carefully staged effect of the trials themselves suffers from the lack of Western safeguards of judicial procedure. When arrests are secret, when many are executed without public trials, when the accused are held for months without indictment, and when the substance of the evidence is developed in secret investigation, the final public confession is bound to be mystifying and largely unconvincing. There are plenty of miscarriages of justice in our courts, to be sure, but at least we have records and possibilities of appeal to minimize them. Our Mooney case and our Sacco-Vanzetti case were such travesties of justice that we have no right to adopt a superior attitude toward the procedure of other countries. Nevertheless in these and other similar cases there are records that can be used to establish the failures of the courts and to arouse protest that makes prosecutors and judges wary of creating more *causes célèbres*. Liberty cannot be safeguarded without constant vigilance and sacrifice, but governments which administer justice in the full view of the public do at least create some public confidence. Far less shock and disillusionment would have been caused by recent events in Russia, if, instead of such mass trials, we had been allowed to see the development of the cases from the beginning.

Trouble in the TVA

FOR YEARS there has been trouble among the three directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, chairman, has been opposed on many issues by the two other directors, Mr. David E. Lilienthal and Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan. The dispute has now reached such a point that it seems impossible for the three men to work together any longer. The press has been filled with their voluminous charges and counter-charges. Demands are also being made for an investigation of the whole operation of the TVA, either by the Federal Trade Commission or a congressional committee.

In briefest outline, Chairman Arthur Morgan accuses his colleagues of refusing to coöperate, of withholding information from him and of overriding his protests. He states that the contract made with the Aluminum Company of America "does not protect the public interest" and that he alone prevented an undesirable agreement with the Arkansas Light and Power Company. He further charges that Messrs. Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan were prepared to mediate the claim of Senator George Berry to be compensated for marble leases on land flooded in the course of TVA construction. Senator Berry's claim was thrown out a few days ago by a federal commission, and Dr. Arthur Morgan feels that this vindicates his position. He complains that the TVA power policy has never been publicly stated and implies that it should have been. He charges that Dr. Harcourt Morgan invariably votes for the power policy of Mr. Lilienthal, who reciprocates by giving his colleague everything he wants in the fields of agriculture and the production of fertilizer.

To these charges Messrs. Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan return a general denial. They insist that Dr. Arthur Morgan has been uncoöperative to such a degree that a continuance of the present board is impossible. They charge that he has collaborated with public-utility officials on several occasions in preparing documents put forward as expressing his own views and they suggest that in general his opinions closely resemble those of the private-utility officials, who are hostile to much of the TVA's underlying idea.

The general criticism of Dr. Arthur Morgan by advocates of public power was expressed, it will be remembered, by Morris L. Cooke in The New Republic of December 9. Mr. Cooke has for years been an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

engineering expert in management, with special knowledge of utilities, and was head of the Rural Electrification Administration. In this article he observed that Dr. Morgan has shown no enthusiasm for publicly owned power at any time in his whole career, and that the flood-control dams which he planned in the past omitted any provision for hydro-electric power. As recently as eighteen months ago, Dr. Morgan was asking equal representation between the government and private interests in formulation of TVA power policy, which would be unfair to the public interest. Dr. Morgan was willing to have private power companies sold to government bodies at a price that would permit "promoters' profits"; he has asked that the compensation to be paid be submitted to arbitration, and has approved of "severance damages" supposedly to cover the loss in cutting off one part of the plant from the remainder. Mr. Cooke opposes all these suggestions. In his opinion, Dr. Morgan is needlessly concerned lest "hidden subsidies" be given to public power plants.

The TVA chairman admires the state utility commissions, whose record Mr. Cooke knows to be bad. Dr. Morgan's suggestion that the utilities should buy power from the government and resell it at a rate to be fixed jointly by the federal government and the utilities is illegal, Mr. Cooke points out, since the federal government cannot interfere in intrastate prices for electricity. Finally, Mr. Cooke draws an unfavorable contrast between Dr. Morgan's actions and those of the two other members of the board, who have fought against the unfair tactics of the private-power interests, have helped large cities in the TVA region to get their own service, and have coöperated fully with the Rural Electrification Administration.

Reluctantly, we are forced to agree that an investigation of the TVA is now desirable. We are reluctant because we are aware of no reason to believe there has been wrongdoing or that important information will be unearthed. The quarrel between Dr. Arthur Morgan and his two colleagues is an old quarrel, and its essence does not lie in the charges brought by Dr. Morgan against his fellow commissioners. It has been blown up to its present proportions by persons who have two axes to grind: first, there are those who wish to hurt the Roosevelt administration in every possible way and second, there are private-utility magnates who are fighting desperately, and often viciously, against the rising tide of public power. Since, however, so much has been made of it, it is probably better that all this mass of charges and counter-charges should be thoroughly looked into. The investigation should also examine propaganda against the TVA by the private utilities. Not many years ago, this industry was exposed, in revelations proved up to the hilt, as seeking to dictate to the nation's press, its colleges, even its grade schools, the attitude to be held in regard to public ownership.

Senator Norris and others have suggested that the investigation be conducted by the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission is a thoroughly competent and informed body; it has ably conducted similar inquiries in the past. Since, however, the charge has been made that it would be sure to "whitewash" Messrs. Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan, we feel that it would be better to avoid the inevitable criticism, and have the work done by a joint congressional committee, provided a committee can be found which approves the administration's power policy. Its members should of course be selected carefully to make sure that the committee will do an honest and impartial piece of work. Under no circumstances should the task be turned over to the House Military Affairs Committee, which recently came under the chairmanship of an implacable enemy of the TVA, or to the equally hostile Senate Commerce Committee. It is not the broad policy that is in question, but acts under that policy.

While this issue is being discussed, there is another aspect of the TVA that requires immediate and careful attention. Mr. Lilienthal has suggested that the competing private utilities in the same area should be bought out, and Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, president of the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation and spokesman for the utilities, has been prompt to take him up. To be sure, the two men do not yet see eye to eye. Mr. Willkie wants any system that is purchased to be taken over as a whole and as "a going concern" —which would allow for what Morris Cooke calls "promoters' profits." Mr. Lilienthal on the contrary wants purchase to be based on reasonable original cost less depreciation, which seems to us a sensible and fair basis for sale. It is in line with the TVA Act, and the Water Power Act of 1920. It is possible that the two men are not so far apart as at first glance they seem. At any rate, the possibilities of settling this vexatious dispute by the means suggested should be explored.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1938,
IN THE U. S., BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC.,
40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Which Way Canada?

THE STRANGE QUALITY in Canadian-American relations is the limited extent to which Canada is understood by her great neighbor. Almost everyone considers her a well governed people, the home of the Mounties, the Quints and sub-zero weather. What is not often realized is that the country is so divided today in race, geography and interests that there is good reason to fear for her continued existence as a national entity. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that today's conflicts are prophetic of tomorrow's disintegration.

Canada began her national life in 1867 with a unity whose broad theoretical basis presumed strong central government. The large economic and social questions were to be the business of federal authority. But this power could only have been exercised if the Canadian "constitution" was given a correspondingly broad interpretation by the courts. Unfortunately, however, such was not the case. A remote judicial body sitting in London has, during the last generation, extended provincial power to a point where a functional solution of national problems is now impossible. In the past year unemployment insurance, minimum wages and maximum hours, dominion-wide marketing schemes and retail-price supervision have all been judicially declared to be outside the sphere of federal power. Central government is today compelled to tread warily through a maze of unrealistic, judge-made provincial "rights."

Behind these developments are economic and social considerations of great consequence. Canada, perhaps more than any other Western nation, is—as André Siegfried has shrewdly pointed out—the product of political rather than of compelling economic forces. Nor have seventy years of federalism dissolved the basic cleavages. The Maritime Provinces, the Lower and Upper St. Lawrence, the Prairies and British Columbia are geographically and economically much more closely related to New England, New York, the Northwest states and the Pacific Coast respectively, than they are to each other. Moreover, these natural divisions are accentuated by a profoundly dangerous racial dualism. For there are three million French-Canadians in Canada, concentrated with relatively unimportant exceptions in Quebec, who live nervously alert to and afraid of any move remotely threatening the continuity of their own language, traditions and power.

In response to the tendency toward greater local authority the provinces are developing an acutely parochial outlook as well as their own unique political movements and personalities. In Ontario the reëlection of Premier Hepburn and the provincial Liberal Party is a commentary on the man himself and the methods he has begun to employ. "Mitch" Hepburn is a small-time Huey Long in speech and manners. He has energy, force and the ability to command strong loyalties. But he has no better than third-class brains to give these talents the direction they must have to remain consistently in the forefront. Nor does he possess a ruthless political machine to guarantee his perpetuation in office, because Ontario political morality does not easily lend itself to such party methods. The keynote of his recent campaign was a virulent attack upon the CIO and "foreign agitators." It may have been intellectually dishonest, but it was unbeatable as a vote-getter among the Ontario farmers on whose "loyalist" anti-American prejudices he played. When this was coupled with the solid support he received from the reactionary mining interests and "faithful" Liberals, it was enough to give him a substantial victory against the colorless Conservative leaders and the disunited, competing labor organizations.

In the nine-ring circus that is Canadian provincial politics, Alberta, during the past three years, has had more than its share of the spotlight. It is a mistake, however, to underestimate its Premier, Mr. Aberhart, since it is this Bible-pounding, psalm-singing demagogue who is the real political experiment and not the pseudo-economics of Social Credit in practice. True, he may be stupid as an economist and naïve as a political leader, but he does attract votes and he does arouse spontaneous support. What is more, he will continue to do so, simply because he voices the unspoken feelings and protests of many westerners against the bankruptcy in constructive programs of the traditional parties and the financial control of the west by eastern Canada through its branch banks, insurance and mortgage companies.

The prairie provinces have frequently bolted the regular party lines. Now, with the rise of first-generation children of foreign-born parents, there is to be seen a phenomenon which has already occurred in large urban centers throughout the United States. Here municipal and state election lists frequently have been distinguished by their limited number of English-Scottish nominees. Similarly, the old stock which came from England, Scotland, Ontario and the Maritimes and has governed the Canadian west ever since it opened in the eighties—because this element had a majority—gradually has been replaced in many western districts by native sons whose parents were the homesteaders and day laborers of the last generation. The effect of this process on party lines is already evident; for by and large new political organizations find their first support among these groups who have no real tradition to bind them to the old line-ups. It is to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these people that the Aberharts of the future can and will make their most effective appeals. And Aberhart, together with Hepburn and Duplessis, speaks a language whose spiritual content in many respects is much closer to Rome and Berlin than to London.

In Quebec events are most disturbing to Canadian liberals. The Duplessis administration is profoundly clerical, avowedly corporatist and almost officially anti-Semitic. Moreover, it is an unhappy example of how well the mechanics of parliamentary and responsible democratic government are adapted to the methods of dictatorship. Within the sphere of property and civil rights the Canadian provinces are constitutionally supreme. Their legislatures have the power to do great damage to the recognized Anglo-American freedoms, since these stand unprotected by any legal inhibitions on legislative action such as a due-process or free-speech clause or a doctrine of natural rights. It is true that the federal authority has a certain special right of veto over provincial enactments, but its use is so fraught with political danger, especially in the case of Quebec, that the national government would hesitate here to employ it. Apart from this procedure, Canada's Fathers of Confederation trusted to the fair-play-decent-thing-to-do concepts in British constitutional practice to protect liberty of the person and security of property; and so the Canadian Constitution says nothing about them.

But modern leaders like Duplessis were trained in a different school. To them brown or black shirts are more acceptable raiment than the old school tie. So it is not surprising to find pro-fascist Duplessis putting through laws to prevent the use of buildings for the meeting of "communists" and the dissemination of "bolshevist" propaganda. As Attorney General, he alone labels men and materials as communist and bolshevist, in order to justify arrest, confiscation and closure of premises. And in the process he is bound by no standard or guide save his own administrative conscience. This infamous "padlock" law has aroused liberal sentiment throughout the Dominion, for it is in essence a criminal measure attacking free speech and invades the federal power over criminal law.

The church and the administration are working hand in hand. Together they have sympathized with fascism in general and with Italy and the Spanish insurgents in particular. Time and again the government has discouraged attempts by supporters of Loyalist Spain to get a public hearing. Culturally related to France, the Quebec politico-clerical hierarchy despised the Popular Front. A united move by the democracies against the fascist totalitarian states would create for Canada a profound dilemma. For to associate herself as a democracy would, perhaps, invite Quebec to a trial of strength against non-French Canada, and for that test the links of Canadian federalism may not be strong enough. Thus, in almost every aspect of Canadian national life the anomaly of French Quebec stands out as a primary problem.

Today a unique and highly important Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations is sitting at various points throughout the country. It is authorized to make an exhaustive inquiry into the constitutional status of and fiscal relationships between the local and central governments. Significantly, Hepburn and Duplessis have threatened an unholy alliance to "gang up" on the Commission's findings should these advocate a more severe limitation upon provincial power. Masterly briefs by two of the prairie provinces have laid bare the bankruptcy and tragedy of the west. By now it has become reasonably clear from the evidence that the Commission may be compelled to make recommendations which must extend the national authority. But whether any Canadian government would have the courage or the party strength to give life to such proposals is a vastly different matter.

Of all the issues that have been debated in the press and Parliament for the past year, none has the ring of urgency which characterizes the contests over foreign policy. Has Canada a foreign policy? Few Canadians would dare to reply with certainty except to say that above all the people desire peace and that in a passive sense there is, perhaps, some sign of a developing policy. In the conduct of her external affairs Canada always swings between two orbits, the imperial and the American. Both afford her incomparable protection against any potential aggressor, but in the process both necessarily reduce the scope within which the country may arrive, by herself, at long-range decisions. It is true that the post-Coronation Imperial Conference (strictly, they are now Commonwealth Conferences) of last May again asserted the absolute theoretical authority of the Dominions to regulate their own international relations. It remains to be seen, however, whether for all practical purposes any attack upon basic Commonwealth interests would not find a Canadian government almost obliged to follow the imperial lead. "We like to manage our own affairs," Mr. King was reported to have said in Paris last summer, "but any threat to England would immediately bring Canada to her side." The Dominion's many isolationists must have winced at the statement.

On the other hand, an official Pan-American movement would face the determined opposition of Quebec. One of the great fears in French Canada is that some day all the nine provinces may be absorbed into the United States. In the process French-Canadian traditions and language would gradually vanish and lead to racial assimilation. Then would follow the complete disappearance of French-Canadians as an independent ethnic group. Whether that fear is sound or not does not alter the fact that in thinking as they do the French resist every move which brings Canada into any greater

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official proximity with the United States than geography demands. Hence, while American decisions are of the highest importance to the Dominion, there is at present almost no hope of open association with the United States in a common North American policy. At the same time, influenced by a rearming Britain and United States, as well as a world plagued by uncertainty, Canada has begun to look to her own negligible defenses.

With sectional conflict, racial disunity and substantial disagreement over foreign policy the prospects for a pragmatic federalism in Canada would seem to be very unhappy. But in the recent strengthening of the country's major leftist party, the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), and the realistic approach taken by the orthodox trade unions toward militant unionism and its political implications, there is hope of a better day.

The CCF in the past five years has become a significant element in Canadian politics. Its growth, however, was not so rapid or widespread as its supporters had anticipated. Several reasons explain this failure. It sought, at first, to embrace every progressive cause. Then it claimed to be a broad Farmer-Labor movement. Finally it held itself out as a haven for intellectuals, left-liberals and those Marxists who could not be happy in the discipline and methods of the existing Communist Party. Not unnaturally, the result was to create a kind of loose unpopular front minus the Communists and without an immediately dangerous reaction which leaders could call the enemy.

A party manifesto was framed at the Regina convention in 1933. It was a brilliant exercise in the formulation of compromise principles of Farmer-Labor socialism to be achieved by constitutional means. Indeed, it was too good. What was needed as a matter of practical politics was less platform precision and more drama. The party had to burn with the cohesive force of single-mindedness in order to give to thousands of young men and women who were in search of political allegiance something on which to hang their hopes and for which they could sincerely fight. And that is precisely the point which was aimed at in the Winnipeg convention of last August. There the need for direct and immediate political struggle was recognized and avowed. That explains why the CCF today, more than at any other time in its short history, gives the promise of important effort, and with the brains at its disposal it must become a vital force in Canadian affairs.

Nor is it a coincidence that the meeting of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress in Ottawa shortly afterward laid down a new and challenging policy. The conference was attended by four hundred delegates representing most of the orthodox national and international unions. There for the first time many "conservative" unions subscribed officially to the position that organized labor must regard specific political action as the only means of assuring the achievement of a planned economy and a better life for the workers of Canada. Equally significant was the acceptance by the convention of the CIO as an operating fact in Canadian labor. Almost everyone recognized that it should be coöperated with and treated as a source of strength rather than a cause of schism. Both of these positions were taken despite the fact that many of the unions were veteran A. F. of L. affiliates with a traditional diffidence toward political action and the further fact of the official malediction pronounced on the CIO by respective parent organizations in the United States. Inevitably the result has been to create a greater unity in the ranks of unionized Canadian workers. Now there is the hope of vigorous and uniform political activity by labor as a whole, in which the CCF will be expected to play a major part.

But these developments have a significance which transcends their immediate effect on the fortunes of Canadian labor. Indeed, they touch closely upon the whole problem of national unity. For undoubtedly the first business of Canadian statesmanship in the next generation is to devise a workable formula of Canadian "federalism." That formula must be based upon the fundamental fact that the great problems of government in the modern state are national in scope. Local authority must yield many of its present "rights" to a centralized control. For Canada this means a formula to satisfy the postulate of national regulation as well as the demands of economic sectionalism and racial dualism. Such a formula must overcome the distrust and defensive separatism of Quebec. It must enlist the good will and unqualified support of an independent and powerful Ontario. It must somehow reach and embrace the very real isolation of the Maritimes and British Columbia. And it must resolve at the source the chronic and rebellious disaffection of the prairies. In a word, it is a stupendous task for political compromise and synthesis. Admittedly, so to pose the problem is dangerously to oversimplify. But it does serve boldly to project the salient features of the question.

Can unity, then, be accomplished? Assuredly, formulas alone must be insufficient. Behind formulas, however, there may be a more real and lasting basis of unity, a basis to be found in the ever growing solidarity among the lower-middle class, the small farmers and the workers of every province and every race. The process is relatively new and its future course will be uncertain and difficult. But its prospects are probably no worse than those which confronted the British Labor Party when it began its thirty-year march toward a Prime Minister and a parliamentary majority. True, a Canadian labor movement today faces very different problems, but the need for it is as great as —perhaps greater than—that which gave rise to its British counterpart.

MAXWELL COHEN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Next?

EVENTS OF THE PAST FORTNIGHT in the field of international affairs have bewildered many people. What is the significance of Chamberlain's new policy? Does it increase the likelihood of peace or war in Europe? What are its repercussions as regards the Far East? Particularly, what effect does it have on our own foreign policy and on the naval-building plans now under consideration in Washington? Some of these questions cannot be answered now, and to discuss all of them would go far beyond the limits of a single brief article. I propose here to deal chiefly with the naval question in the light of these happenings.

A first result of Prime Minister Chamberlain's announcement of policy is to stop most of the voices in America demanding immediate action for collective security. The argument was that the United States should coöperate with Great Britain, France and Soviet Russia in a firm front against the bandit powers. But Great Britain, it is clear, will do no such thing. The French will follow the British, having, unhappily, no alternative. Even Soviet Russia seems to be changing her policy. Walter Duranty a few days ago cabled to The New York Times that "the idea of collective security . . . is viewed [by Soviet officials] as being as dead as the proverbial doornail." H. N. Brailsford in last week's New Republic revealed the fact that negotiations for a common policy between Great Britain and Soviet Russia in the Far East broke down when the British refused Stalin's indispensable condition, that if Russia accepted, Britain should guarantee the inviolability of her western frontier. Stalin's recent widely publicized letter is interpreted as indicating foreknowledge of what Mr. Chamberlain was about to do, and as an effort to jilt the bourgeois democratic governments before they jilted him. If this interpretation proved correct, the Soviet Union would in the future rely upon its own strength plus whatever assistance it could obtain from the proletariat of other countries throughout the world. It is certainly not impossible that the American Communists who continue to demand our participation in "collective security" may wake up some morning to find themselves deviating badly from the official line in Moscow.

If Washington observers are correct, American officials, while they now bitterly regret the President's quarantine speech, and are sorry that the idea of collective security received so much endorsement as it has from Secretary Hull and others, still feel that something can be salvaged from the policy now partly undermined. For one thing, they hope that British public opinion may force a return to Eden's line. For another, the Americans consider that in any case, "parallel action" in the Orient continues to be a possibility. In Europe, according to this argument, Britain has most to gain—or thinks she has—by being friendly with the dictatorships; in the Far East, her interests lie with the United States. In particular, we are told that Great Britain cannot afford to come to a separate understanding with Japan because of the shockingly bad effect upon the prestige of the white man, not only in the Orient itself but in India. Therefore, as Washington officials see it, we can still work out a tacit understanding with the British for joint or concerted action in the Western Pacific. If a firm Anglo-Italian understanding has been or will be reached, Britain will be free for the first time to send a large part of her fleet to the Orient and thus prove that she means business.

This is an attractive theory, especially to an American government smarting under the humiliation of such a rebuff as Mr. Chamberlain has given it; but it overlooks one or two important things. It would be extremely difficult for the British Tories to make friends with Berlin and Rome while carrying on a policy actively hostile to the third member of the triumvirate: Tokyo. The British are decidedly uneasy as to the increasing radicalism of Chiang Kai-shek's government in China, his understanding with the Chinese Communists, the terms on which Soviet Russia is now supplying him with airplanes and munitions. British policy has traditionally been one of friendship with Japan, signalized in the Anglo-Japanese alliance which came to an end only after the Washington Conference of 1921. There have been persistent rumors that Britain and Japan have already reached an agreement under which, for a price, Japan has agreed to keep hands off Hongkong and Canton.

To say all this is not to say that the British are on the point of making another Hoare-Laval plan that would sell out China as this same British government once tried to sell out Ethiopia. What seems to me far more likely is that Britain is working in China for a negotiated peace, as she has done in Spain. In the latter case, it is now fairly clear that from the beginning she has sought to prevent a knockout blow by either side. She has hoped to arrange a truce and a peace settlement under her own auspices that would at once prevent a radical regime, linked to Moscow, and a puppet government owing allegiance to Germany, Italy, or both. There is no humanitarian nonsense about the dominant group in the British Cabinet. It cares little for the feelings or the lives of the Spanish people, provided the government which rules them is properly respectful of (a) British interests in and trade with Spain and (b) British access to and control of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mediterranean, Egypt, Suez, Palestine and points east.

Is it not in the cards that Britain would like to see a roughly similar development in the Far East? China has now amply proved her powers of resistance. Japan is daily sinking deeper in the morass of financial and economic difficulty. If either side should win overwhelmingly, its first act would be to throw the white man out of the Orient. Under the circumstances, and in view of the well known predilections of the British Tories, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they might seek to bring about a negotiated peace. Let the Japanese retain the area north of the Great Wall. Let Japanese advisers participate in the local governments of the other northern provinces. Let not only the Japanese but all foreign troops be withdrawn from China on a time schedule covering a year or two. Arrange very large foreign loans on a consortium basis, each of the powers contributing a fixed percentage and enjoying a fixed percentage of China's foreign trade. Follow this with another conference for naval limitation. To be sure, Japan might not accept these terms, though every passing day makes it seem more reasonable to suppose she will. Her situation is becoming constantly more serious, and the Chinese, with foreign assistance, have completely upset Japanese plans by the effectiveness of their resistance.

I do not say that this is Britain's fixed determination in the Far East. I only say that no one can be sure it is not, and that it would be the height of folly for the United States to base its policy on a contrary assumption. England refused to follow our lead in Manchuria in 1931, and we were left out on a limb. England again refused to follow our lead when the United States sought to impose oil sanctions on Italy early in the Ethiopian affair, and again we were out on a limb. England agreed only with reluctance and tardily to open negotiations for a trade treaty with the United States. I would only suggest that before we base on British coöperation such a vital American policy as our attitude in the Far East, we had better make sure that we know what we are doing.

Meanwhile, however, the effort to increase the American navy goes forward, despite strong protests from many quarters. The explanations that have been offered by those supposedly able to speak with authority are numerous and self-contradictory. Admiral Leahy says at one time that our navy is purely defensive, and at another that we must be able to protect South America from invasion by European fascists. Certainly such an increase as is proposed would be far from adequate for the second purpose. Mr. Walter Lippmann, presumably a spokesman for those who want a big navy, says we must protect the Philippines; but Admiral Leahy tells us this would be impossible unless we had three times as many ships as are now asked. Secretary Hull says that we must maintain the sanctity of treaties and help preserve law and order throughout the world. How many ships would that take? President Roosevelt says the increase is needed because we have two coasts and must defend them both; but again Admiral Leahy and other experts insist that to make us secure we should need two or three times as many ships as are now asked. Meanwhile, the dispute rages as to whether the kind of navy that is planned is actually intended for defense, as the administration of course insists it is, or to fight in any part of the world. Charges are also made that the battleship is obsolete, that new types of aerial bombs are deadly against it, and that official reports saying so have been suppressed.

Laymen are not competent to pass upon these technical matters; but general policy is not technical. When President Roosevelt suggests, for example, that we must defend both coasts simultaneously, what power or combination of powers does he think could conceivably be engaged in such an attack? When Admiral Leahy asks us to prevent, with battleships, a fascist invasion of Latin America he opens up some very big questions. As everyone knows, three-quarters of the South and Central American republics are at least three-quarters fascist today, not primarily because of European propaganda but because of their own internal weaknesses. At what point exactly does a Latin American state become sufficiently fascist so that we must rush our warships down and begin bombarding its seaports? Why should Italy or Germany send their vessels to fight us in Latin American waters, when they might get everything they want by peaceful economic and cultural penetration (or by fomenting civil wars in which natives did the fighting for them)? Are we really prepared to dictate to Latin America with which European countries it shall be friendly, and what form of government it shall practise? If so, this is not the Monroe Doctrine or the good-neighbor policy. It is old-fashioned American imperialism, with a vengeance.

Amid the maze of contradictory hypotheses, we must not overlook one more: that the present American program may be intended primarily for bargaining purposes if another conference for limitation of armament should be held. This strategy was followed with success before the Washington Conference of 1921; we announced an intention to build more ships than anyone else could afford to construct, and at the same time offered to scrap them if there were a general agreement. Trial balloons have lately been set afloat by Japan that suggest she might not be averse to a new conference a few months hence. There are of course difficulties now that did not exist in 1921. We must also remember that the size of the Japanese navy does not, within very broad limits, matter to the United States unless we are intending to act aggressively in the neighborhood of Japan herself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The distinction set up in American public discussion in recent months between collective security and isolation seems to me an unreal one. It is obvious that we cannot survive unscathed as a water-tight compartment in a sinking ship. I, for one, am a collectivist and always have been. The question is, on what terms and for what ends are we to coöperate with the rest of the world? Granting that the fascist powers are today demanding many things to which they are not entitled on any possible basis of justice, must we fight to maintain a status quo created in 1919 which many of us have spent much of our time for nineteen years in denouncing as unjust and unworkable? Does anyone believe that the "bandit nations" will respond to pressure from without in any other way than all nations have always responded to such pressure? Should American radicals, in particular, abandon their lifelong principles and support one type of exploitative international capitalism against another for temporary and opportunist reasons? If we fight another war "to make the world safe for democracy," is there any reason to believe that we shall come out of it any better off than we were at the end of the last war? These are questions which it seems to me should be answered before the foreign policy of the United States is based upon the hypotheses they discuss. BRUCE BLIVEN

Maxims and Anecdotes: II[1]

Ways of Naming One's Number

UNEARNED INCREMENT: In Germany, though the people have built roads for many centuries, when they build a road after 1933, Hitler builds it.

"OUT, DAMNED SPOT": A Dutch kitchen is a *Puritan* kitchen; the scouring is partially a ritual, a "symbolic" cleansing. This purely material expression of ritualistic purification may derive in part from the dropping of the confessional from Protestant religious practices. Catholic countries could be materially dirtier without a sense of contamination, because the sense of the unclean was periodically mitigated by purificatory rituals (admission and remission of sin, sin *canceled* by penance).

TURNING A CURSE INTO A COMPLIMENT: Those who experience difficulty in remembering the names of close acquaintances when introducing them might console themselves somewhat by noting that their sudden forgetfulness indicates sensitiveness to the subtleties of identity. At the moment of introduction, they tend to alter their relationship to each of the introduced, seeing them as strangers (in keeping with the nature of the situation). And so closely are names associated with identities, that in thus shifting their attitude towards the personal identities of the persons they are introducing, they lose their grip upon the names.

HOW SOCRATES BECAME AN AWFULLY GOOD LISTENER: The young girl, with little to talk about, soon discovers how easy it is to establish communion by asking the young man about his plans. So Socrates, by asking questions, was apparently doing the most *social* of acts. But Socrates was an ironist. He did not merely ask questions. He *kept on* asking questions. He persisted. He *in*sisted. And by driving on and on, piling one question atop another, he subtly converted the business of communion into an extremely annoying occupation. In fact, people felt like killing him. In fact, they did kill him.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES OF THE MIND: The simplest instance of conflicting identities is to be found in the old stories showing the hero "torn between love and duty." "Duty" is a shorthand way of indicating his identification with some larger corporate unit (church, nation, party). "Love" is shorthand for his membership in "the smallest corporation," a partnership of two.

CITY MYSTICS: The stories in the New York papers last year, after the failure of the power plant in one portion of the city had caused several hours of total darkness, were written in a tone of awe. Reading them, one felt that if some new cosmic radiation entered the solar system, to make the performance of electricity a bit irregular, as with the weather, urban populations would start praying for electricity as farmers pray for rain.

Strategies of Art

ON "PLAYING" A BOOK: The reader does not merely *appreciate* a work of art. He *makes* it. He *participates*. The words on the page are like musical notation, and in reading them we *perform*.

HOMELY CRITICISM: You have heard tributes to "folk art." You should also give thought to "folk criticism." By "folk criticism" we mean those remarkably "efficient" shortcuts, equal in their "abstract shorthand" to any scientific term imaginable, which our people have

[1] These aphorisms, like those published in our issue of February 23, are taken from Kenneth Burke's "Attitudes Toward History" (published in The New Republic Dollar Series, in two volumes). The author has added titles and made some changes in wording, so that each item might be clear without its context. The selections are offered for their interest in themselves; they are not intended as an outline of the book.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developed or borrowed, and passed around, to name the situations, processes and strategies that strike them as typical and recurrent. Such terms stem particularly from the vocabularies of politics, business, sports and crime: "steamroller," "gang up on," "sales drive," "build-up." If education and printing have done great damage to the *imaginative* aspect of popular expression, they have made for a great fertility of "*folk* criticism."

HOW TO WRITE BRIGHTLY: Find out something about the tariff that you can tell your friends in a sentence. Expand it by adroit variations into an article. And you are the ideal reporter—whereupon, in the course of a lifetime, many handsome trees have been chopped down, as you learn how to say, very swiftly in several hundred words, something that can be said quite slowly in one short paragraph.

TWO WAYS OF BALANCING ONE'S ACCOUNTS: Humor is the opposite of the heroic. The heroic promotes acceptance by *magnification*, making the hero's character as great as the situation he confronts, but humor reverses the process: it takes up the slack between the momentousness of the situation and the feebleness of those in the situation by *dwarfing the situation*.

AT HOME WITH THE ENEMY: The satirist attacks *in others* the weaknesses and temptations that are really within himself. Is he whipped with his own lash? He is.

THE SEARCH FOR ESSENCE: Art was supposed to contain an element of beauty, present in varying degrees of density or diffusion. All that one should do, apparently, was find a way of straining off this "beauty," and then construct a work of this element alone. Hence, the search for "pure form"—beauty "in the abstract." The attempts to get "religion" or "beauty" in pure isolation, rather than as a function of "practical impurity," are variants of the fertile "lead" suggested in "Alice in Wonderland"; the smiling cat vanishes, leaving only her smile. It was "pure" smile, the most "efficient" smile possible. And that's all you need ever do, to isolate one quality, making it the whole of life. Just get the smile without the cat. Or start with the cat, make it smile, and then take away the cat—and if you have performed the experiment properly, you are left in possession of an unadulterated smile, the *smiliness* of smile, an "efficient," abstract essence.

THE CONTINUITY BEHIND CHANGE: We might even say that the work of art cannot be constructed without a belief in "the divinity of kings" (though hastening to add that these "kings" may even take the paradoxical form of "proletarians," while their "property in" divinity may take the form of a property in historical necessity).

WARNING AGAINST THOROUGHNESS: Goethe has suggested that he was equipped as a writer to imagine himself committting every crime. Similarly, a writer who could imagine himself in the many humiliating roles that are in fashion today would, by this very ability, open himself to great risk. A purely *external* approach to such characters would protect him greatly. If he merely described their *behavior*, without depth in imagining the state of their *minds*, his superficiality would contribute to his comfort.

HOW TO BE A YES-MAN AGGRESSIVELY: The Italian Futurists, to praise war, needed only to recite its *horrors*, and call them beautiful (somewhat as the ancient Greeks had considered the left side ill omened, and had made up the difference euphemistically by calling the left flank of their armies the "well named"). Futurism could provide the most rudimentary kind of solace. Were the streets noisy? It could counter by advocating an uncritical cult of noise. Might there be stench? It could discuss the glories of stench. *Apparently* active, it was in essence the most passive of attitudes, an elaborate method for feeling *assertive* by a resolve to drift with the current.

WHERE LIES THE FUTURE: One wants to know "the trend." So one prints a questionnaire on a postcard:

I think America needs { fascism / communism / private enterprise / religious revival / primitivism }

One gets up a sample mailing list. And when the addressees have sent in their answers, checked off and dropped in the nearest mail box, one tabulates the returns. If the list was not "selective," by a simple matter of arithmetic you can learn the "attitude of the public" on this important issue. And you can size up the "trend of history" accordingly. As a matter of fact, the expression of the vote (if by "voting" you mean this empty, passive, random process) tells you *nothing*. The future is really disclosed by finding out what people can sing about. It is in such qualitative tests requiring the active enlistment of a man's full faculties, giving full psychological employment, that you find the materials for prophecy. You find the course of history foretold in the areas where people cannot possibly "sell out" or make decisions at random. You find the course of Germany foretold, for instance, in the fact that her writers cannot delegate their powers to Hitler's service.

ENVOI: Perhaps the most important thing is not our formulae, or any other formulae, as it is the *attitude* to which any formulae give substance. The important thing is to continue the search for a vocabulary that, as Gide might say, could provide humility without humiliation.

KENNETH BURKE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

Gerson and the Red-Baiters

THE NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS of New York City are carrying on a campaign that has aspects interesting to the entire nation. I refer to the drive being made against Simon W. Gerson. Mr. Gerson is a member of the Communist Party and Stanley Isaacs (Republican) has appointed him as his assistant. I believe the technical title is "confidential examiner." The job pays about $65 a week and this position with the Borough President of Manhattan is not one of the rich plums of patronage nor could it possibly be called a key position in the city administration.

When Gerson was first appointed I assume that a certain number of citizens may have expressed mild surprise at this passing collaboration between a Republican and a Communist. But certainly no one saw excited little groups of men and women standing on street corners and exclaiming, "The end has come. This is the revolution." To be perfectly frank about it, nobody seemed to give a damn. But we have now been treated to the spectacle of what the press can do to whip up emotion. Editors are fond of saying that their proper task is to reflect public sentiment. But when they hold a mirror up to get a popular reaction and fail to find any mist upon the glass, editors often begin to puff very lustily on their own account.

Certain easy pedals can be pushed. It is no trouble at all to get some Legion official in a lather. And there are Catholic groups which can be called into action with nothing more than a penny postcard or a telephone call. In fact a newspaper publisher can create "vast popular indignation" in fifteen minutes by talking to six people.

It's a good trick, but a prety shabby performance, this business of manufacturing popular clamor. One may well suspect that the average editor's tongue grows a little callous from being continually pressed against his cheek during working hours. The outcry concerning Gerson was wholly a fabricated product. The Hearst press did most of the spadework. Nobody paid very much attention. After all the Hearst papers have been Red-baiting for such a long period that their shrill cries of alarm fail to stir the populace. Indeed, the warning note has come to be regarded as little more than an echo.

It is true that The Sun came into the campaign pretty early, but The Sun is read almost entirely for its excellent sport pages. Its editorials are little more than inter-office communications. But as the whole drive on Gerson started to sag, new recruits joined the pack. J. David Stern seems to be anxious to convince his advertisers that his liberalism is nothing which should cause them any worry. The Gerson case gave him an opportunity to indicate that he could, if need be, stand shoulder to shoulder with The Sun. And once he came into the picture, all the bars were let down as far as The World-Telegram is concerned. For the last two years a kind of yacht race has gone on in which the two proprietors have jockeyed around trying to get the precise spot which would give them the advantage of progressive support without alienating the conservatives.

Poor Gerson became a guinea pig for vivisection by the publishers. A matter of no great moment was built up into eight-column headlines. And now it really is important because it touches the whole problem as to whether political appointments should be made on merit or according to the familiar code of the spoils system. If Stanley Isaacs had appointed some wholly inefficient Republican hack to the post of examiner, no criticism would have been raised. But Mr. Isaacs decided to get an able person for the job. Gerson had been a City Hall reporter and his colleagues on that job regarded him as one of their leading lights.

The wholly unjustified cry has been raised that Stanley Isaacs, looking over the entire field of the unemployed, chose a Communist. Of course there is no tradition that secretaries and examiners must be men who were hitherto without occupation. On the contrary the usual practice has been to get a working newspaperman who knew the ropes and could get going immediately after being sworn in.

The irony of the fight against Gerson is the fact that it has been largely waged by editors who profess to believe in proportional representation. It is true that no Communist was elected to the City Council, but one member of that party almost made the grade and there is grave suspicion that he got a rough count when the ballots were tabulated. If one believes in proportional representation I do not see why he should object to the use of the same system in the matter of appointment. The Communist Party, to be sure, is a minority group in New York City, but it did go to bat for LaGuardia in the last election. Radicals and conservatives can very reasonably get together on the proposition that honest and efficient municipal government is better than corrupt and sloppy administration. There is nothing in radical philosophy which works for a tolerance of graft. And in such problems as housing, a liberal mayor might well expect and even bid for the support of the left.

The coalition upon which LaGuardia depends for support is a curious one. Never before in American politics has a man been able to set up a united front between the extreme right and the extreme left. Union Square and the Union League used to be separated by many miles. But in the last campaign some economic royalists and revolutionists touched elbows.

For the most part LaGuardia's appointments have gone to men of conservative kidney. But it has been a balanced ration, and the labor groups and Socialists are well represented. The appointment of a lone Communist to a minor post could hardly be said to destroy the balance. Of course there is no sincerity in the assertion that Gerson in his task holds a key spot in which to plot the destruction of the capitalist system. Some of his hecklers have submitted long questionnaires asking him to state his position as to the existence of a personal God. The answer might well be, "That doesn't come into my domain as examiner for the Borough President."

And most of the other interrogations have been equally aimless. According to American democratic tradition, there is nothing that bars a Communist from being elected to office. In New York State, at any rate, this is a legal party. And so for the life of me I cannot understand the contention that some constitutional provision has been transgressed in the appointment of a Communist.

Just one question should concern the voters of New

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York. It is as simple as this, "Has Si Gerson the ability and the capacity to do a good job?" And that question really shouldn't be left to officials of the Legion and spokesmen of religious groups. The men and women capable of passing on Gerson's ability are the members of his own craft. And they have already rendered an opinion. He was elected as a delegate to the last national convention of the American Newspaper Guild. Personally I'm getting increasingly sore at the spectacle of a good reporter's being rolled around by politicians and publishers who have neither the desire nor the ability to carry on the job for which he is well fitted.

HEYWOOD BROUN

Washington Notes

Planters' Punch

LAST WEEK Senator Harry F. Byrd, member of a distinguished Southern land-holding family, announced the start of a campaign against Mr. Roosevelt's reorganization bill. Almost at the same moment, Chairman Pat Harrison of the Senate Finance Committee, also a Southerner, let it be known that his committee had a thirteen-to-eight majority against the "third basket" tax bill. As his two colleagues were speaking, still a third Southerner, Mr. James F. Byrnes, convened the Senate's special committee on unemployment to hear a wide-ranging indictment of the New Deal by the Democratic Party's good gray money-collector, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch.

The juncture of these three events was doubtless an accident. Yet they have a meaning that liberals cannot afford to overlook. For the first time since 1933, the Tories appear to be united, and to have an accepted strategic plan. Using the Southern Senators, they are out to capture the Democratic Party. Seemingly they mean to commit this act of larceny while the depression keeps Mr. Roosevelt and his aides voiceless. Last week you could almost hear their burglars' kits as they went to work.

Until a short time ago, the Tories were badly split. There were three distinct groups. One was composed of the yearners after a home-bred fascism. In 1934-35, these were the financiers of the Sentinels of the Republic and similar bodies of overeducated and underbrained young people. Most of these semi-fascist ventures have withered away, although on the Pacific Coast the Cincinnatus group seems still to be flourishing. After investing several million dollars in fascism, this first Tory group is apparently ready to quit.

A second and more important group has included those who were prepared to stick to constitutional methods, but who felt their only chance of success lay in a break-up of the Democratic Party, and the amalgamation of its reactionary wing with the Republicans. Senators Vandenberg and Burke have been perhaps the most conspicuous politicians in this faction. Both men, incidentally, would stand to benefit in their home states of Michigan and Nebraska by a Democratic-Republican fusion.

The third Tory group has been the Southerners. In the South, the Democratic tag is all-important, and Southerners have shied away from combination with damyankee Republicans. They have argued that, given sufficient support, they could eject the New Deal "foreigners," and make the Democratic Party as toothless and safe as it was under Messrs. John W. Davis and Al Smith.

During the Supreme Court fight a year ago, the believers in Democratic-Republican fusion clearly held the intellectual leadership of the Tories. There were weeks when a crack-up in the Democratic Party seemed very near. But it did not happen, and with the special session last fall, the Southern group and its allies—those who believed the Democratic organization could be purloined from under Mr. Roosevelt's nose—began to gain in prestige. It was the Southerners who tied the special session in bowknots. To all appearances, they now have full command of the Tory cause. Last week, in a sense, was a historic turning-point. It marked the end of wavering among the Tories, and the beginning of a drive to discredit the New Deal in its own house.

Mr. Baruch's appearance before the Byrnes committee had the effect of giving archiepiscopal sanction to the Senate warriors. Mr. Baruch has a fabulous reputation within the conservative wing of the Democratic Party for political acumen. He has never before permitted himself direct public criticism of the New Deal. His appearance in Washington last week was taken by many observers as notice that the Big Push had formally begun.

Unaccountably enough, the unofficial protest of the Mexican government against the mistreatment of its nationals in the San Antonio pecan-shellers' strike has gone almost unnoticed in the press. Perhaps a third of the six or seven thousand strikers are believed to be Mexican citizens. Allegedly on orders from San Antonio's mayor, Charles K. Quin—who incidentally is the chief political enemy of Congressman Maury Maverick—the police have manhandled the strikers without mercy. Strikers have been bundled into trucks, driven to the edge of town and told to keep going. Several hundred have been put in jail for varying periods. One night, when the prisoners were shouting, "Viva CIO" and singing union songs, a fire hose was played on them until they were half-drowned into silence. On three occasions, the police are reported to have used tear gas. Such conduct is in violation of the responsibility of a civilized state to provide for the personal security of foreigners within its borders. The State Department, slightly pink about the ears, is understood to have relayed the Mexican complaints to Governor Allred of Texas. Presumably they were one of the reasons that induced Mr. Allred last week to order an investigation and hearing by the Texas Industrial Board. Our government has frequently objected on behalf of United States investors to what it considered uncivilized conduct by the Caribbean nations. Now this country, at least unofficially, is being called to order, but on behalf of some of the most wretchedly underpaid workers of the industrial system.

There is a curious little story behind Mr. John L. Lewis' refusal to act as a sponsor for the twenty-fifth birthday celebration of the Department of Labor. A short time ago members of the CIO secretariat were told by a number of informants that Secretary Perkins, in the course

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of conversation, had extolled the virtues of Mr. William Green, and declared that if he ever wanted to come to the Department of Labor, she had a place for him. As for Mr. Lewis, she wished she might speak of him in the same high terms, but etc., etc. Whether these reports were accurate, this department does not know, but they were received as true at the CIO. CIO members did not become unduly angry, however. The revelation that Miss Perkins thought Mr. Green might soon be job-hunting pleased them greatly.

Washington T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Making China Safe for Standard Oil

IT IS A NICE POINT INDEED, how wars are made. It isn't just a word, a blow and a battle. The rulers of men do bad things or crazy things or maybe just foolish things—indeed maybe just thoughtless things—today and then twenty years hence a nice Grade-A war blooms out of that old seed. It would be impossible to put your finger on a better clinical specimen of this sort of thing than the "Panay" bombing and the resulting conniption fits to Mr. Hull.

A naïve naval lieutenant, writing in The New York Times, tells how the "Panay" came to be in the Yangtze River. It is part of the romantic story of the Yangtze patrol and the lieutenant tells it in the usual "Anchors Aweigh" tempo. There are an awful lot of pirates on the Yangtze it seems, who harass passengers and passenger boats. So those great and good powers, Britain, France, Japan, Italy and the United States, established the patrol in order to make the reaches of the Yangtze-Kiang safe for democracy. But it was all done under treaties with the Chinese government, he assures us, adding that the United States sent its first gunboat to the river in 1903.

But you really have to go back a little farther than that. In 1858 that great champion of all forms of external democracy, Great Britain, made a treaty with China. It was one of those perfectly voluntary treaties which China was happy to make after Great Britain had shot up several of her cities. The treaty provided that "British ships of war coming for no hostile purpose or being employed in pursuit of pirates shall be at liberty to visit all ports within the dominions of the Emperor and shall receive every facility for the purchase of provisions and, if occasion require, making repairs."

This privilege the British availed themselves of freely. Then in 1903, the United States was swelling out as a "great world power," as our people loved to say in those days. American business interests were pushing out and, among them, the Standard Oil Company. So one day a gunboat, the "Villalobos," wandered up the Yangtze to some port to which the Navy Department sent her. The Chinese promptly protested. But the State Department equally promptly notified the Navy Department that it was within its rights. Under the treaty of 1858, Great Britain enjoyed the right to send warships into these rivers and the United States, therefore, had the same right under the most-favored-nation clause in her treaty with China. We stood on that.

It is one thing to have the right to send warships on a visit to Chinese ports, to be permitted to provision and even make repairs. It is another thing to set up a fleet with an established service which takes over the patrol of the river. This is what we have done. It is, first and last, an act of unmixed impudence. We do not permit China or any other country to navigate our rivers. We do not permit foreign vessels even to engage in coastal business. We do not permit Chinese even to enter this country. But we not only navigate the rivers of China under treaties extorted at the muzzle of guns; we establish a patrol of warships in their rivers. But this is not all.

Why do we do this? The lieutenant tells why in his Times story. "The special charges of these boats," he says, "are the Standard Oil boats, which carry fuel for the lamps of China; the Yangtze Rapids Steamship Company which carries everything, including passengers; and the missions." And thereby hangs a tale.

Apparently the Yangtze River patrol had an inadequate force. So in 1924 the Navy League set out to make this Yangtze patrol more adequate. The Navy League is the organization that works night and day, year in and year out, along with the armament workers, for an ever bigger navy. Why it was interested in the minute expansion involved in building just a few gunboats for the old Chinese river I do not know. But one is entitled to guess from the following letter, written February 18, 1924, by W. M. Galvin, secretary of the Navy League, to Admiral Long:

> Commander Marion Eppley, who served as National Navy Day Chairman for 1923, has asked me to let you know that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has authorized its foreign-commerce-department committee to give definite support to the proposed legislation for the establishment of an adequate naval patrol on the Yangtze River. The action, Commander Eppley believes, is due entirely to your suggestion that the matter be brought to the attention of the Chamber of Commerce through the Standard Oil Company.

So in 1924 the Standard Oil Company was working to get the navy to establish an adequate patrol on this troubled Chinese river, running up to Chungking, 1,500 miles into the heart of China. This is part of that precious doctrine that the United States navy should help police the world.

Then on November 17, 1933, Mr. Harold C. Washburn, of the Navy League, writing to the president of the Navy League, said:

> I have been working hammer and tongs. On Tuesday I talked with Mr. William R. Conklin, one of Mr. John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s attorneys, and he will help me prepare a letter and a two-page statement of the "case" of the Navy League to go to Rockefeller direct, though we both know it will go to Raymond B. Fosdick . . . who has not been interested in it and has turned down the approach of Mr. Gardiner and perhaps others. I have known that all along. My friend Conklin, however, is sold on clearing up any misunderstanding on Fosdick's part and convincing him of the national importance of the Navy League's work—and the importance of protecting by naval power the vast overseas and large shipping interests of the Standard Oil companies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So, the Navy League, which had helped Standard Oil in establishing the Yangtze patrol, was now trying to shake down John D. for a contribution. It is to the credit of Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Fosdick that they seemed to be turning an insensitive surface to the patriots.

And now the "Panay," one of the gunboats of the fleet of the Yangtse patrol, whose chief care is convoying and protecting the oil tankers of the Standard Oil Company many miles up into the very heart of China, is blown up when it gets in between the warring Japanese and Chinese armies and while convoying three Standard Oil boats.

And now the American people are lashed into a patriotic fury over the attack on one of the boats in this impudent patrol and, as Admiral Leahy pointed out, we are brought closer to war than at any time since 1917. If the President wants to avoid war with Japan, why not yank the Yangtze patrol out of the Yangtze? Why not stand on his August 31 proclamation to all Americans to get out of China or understand finally that they remain at their peril and not at the peril of this great peace-loving nation? Instead, the President and his Secretary of State become provacateurs and ask the nation to spend, first $800,000,000, then, as it turns out, $1,000,000,000, and now finally $3,000,000,000 for more boats to protect more of "our" interests.

That's how wars are made. JOHN T. FLYNN

Surprising Confirmations

Art without Epoch, edited by Ludwig Goldschneider. New York: The Oxford University Press. 140 pages. $2.50.

WHEN, to take a small item in a larger subject, I went to college classes, I was told that there were three types of capitals: Doric, Ionic and Corinthian (plus something said about flutings and acanthus leaves); and I remember the surprise I felt soon after when I traveled abroad. At Monreale, above Palermo, there were other sorts of capitals in abundance; and later at Ravenna I found so many in so many styles and fancies that I was lost in an unclassified bewilderment. And then still later came Romanesque capitals, Gothic, et cetera. But with the kindliness of youth I took it all simply, reflecting that either I had not heard just what my professor said, or else must remember the natural human weakness for short cuts to finality.

We may also conceive that a thing, a race or an epoch should have some characteristic quality most expressive of it. This quality is perceived, and presently is thought of as complete. The temptation, indeed, is to think of it as unbroken; and there have been those who saw any exception to this given quality as decadence. Meanwhile we must remember that falling off from a characteristic quality or style is one thing and falling off from artistic excellence is another.

As to works of art, certainly the past changes as rapidly as the present. The Roman copies that remain to us of Greek masterpieces and that Goethe, Lessing and Winckelmann so admired are dead as a doornail nowadays, a tedious mass of pudding surface. And the High Renaissance seems on the point of fading: Guido Reni and his fellows certainly, and for all their scope and example, even the Raphael frescoes—there is something disconcerting about Goethe's remark that "that which has been long discovered will be buried again." On the other hand the archaic Greek, for example, the Egyptian and Mexican are rising. El Greco, long despised, is now a luminary, and the Baroque will not down.

We must not give this discussion too much of the slant that Mr. Ludwig Goldscheider gives it in the introduction to his "Art without Epoch." He speaks of these one hundred and forty reproductions as works of art "which appeal to the modern eye with undiminished strength." He adds that "it is the past as it appears to us today" that he has tried to present. These instances so cleverly and arduously chosen from the wide range of art works have undoubtedly a curious appeal that derives from their resemblance to, or anticipation of, certain modern instances. The drawing of a female nude from a Greek oil flask of the fifth century B.C. is undoubtedly like Renoir; the two Egyptian wrestlers from a wall painting of about 1900 B.C. are startlingly like Matisse; and you may if you like say of the Adam and Eve by Ludwig Münstermann, early seventeenth century, that it is "a miracle of draughtsmanship and plane-construction fulfilling the requirements of even the most meticulous modern sculptor"; or that the twelfth-century mosaic head from the Capella Palatina is an example of expressionistic-decorative style from which a straight path leads to Van Gogh. From these and like cases we get a delighted sense of identities, recurrences or continuities in human experience. But we also see them as illustrations of how, regardless of epochs, the content determines the form.

The two male portraits (numbers four and five) by the sculptor Thutmose (circa 1370 B.C.) display almost startlingly the characteristic and fortuitous elements in an individual's appearance; above the simplified eyelids the treatment of the shadows is deliberate and compelling, and prepares us for a more stylized rhythmic arrangement of the wrinkles on the brow. The naturalistic-impressionistic element in the Greek bronze of a stag (fifth century B.C.) is more evident than is often the case with our modern sculptors who prattle more of the term itself. The absence of stylization in the bust of one of Alexander's successors (circa 300 B.C.) makes it a surprise to the admirers of Greek portraiture. The dogs belonging to the period of the Roman Empire have reached a point in the observation of nature beyond which we cannot go. Some of the Roman portraits could happen almost anywhere today. The bronze crucifix from the Church of St. Ludger at Werden Ander Ruhr (eleventh century) has the exact qualities which in the sculptors of our own generation who experimented with similar forms for the expression of faith aroused storms of indignation and journalistic attack. And to cap it all, Professor Goldscheider shows two photographs of the head of the tenth-century Christ from the Gero Cross in Cologne Cathedral that use the same original to illustrate two modern tendencies. In one of these photographs is revealed the height of impressionism that this sculpture exhibits. In the other photograph, taken ten years later—a profile view—it is the severity of form rather than expressionistic analysis that is revealed. There is too a Peruvian head of about 1000 A.D. that is wholly disconcerting in its modern recognitions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most permanent aspect of the matter, nevertheless, is not that divers works of art still satisfy our modern taste, but rather that there has been expressed in them, whatever their century or centuries, something which was there to express and which we can experience and recognize. It is, first of all, by virtue of what they had to express that these works depart from what has been recognized as the typical style and product of their respective epochs. The great artists no doubt have usually belonged to their epochs and have fitted into, and even helped to determine, the style of their respective epochs. Easy examples are Phidias and the sculptors of his period, or the Venetian Giorgione, Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese, etc. Each one of these, though he is so much a part of his time, is also individual to himself. Only a superficial judgment would see them as the same—exactly as Pascal meant when he said that "the more intelligence one has the more original men one finds. Commonplace people see no difference among men." Meanwhile there is always apt to occur the artist who, as Romain Rolland said of Gandhi, "is at ease only when in the minority." The same things are true of the content—the qualities or the ideas—to be expressed in art.

This remarkable book, chosen with such flair, labor and oddity of insight, is both a confirmation and a surprise, a subtle encouragement toward first the perception of qualities and afterward the knowledge of types, schools and epochs.

STARK YOUNG

Film-Goers' Grab Bag

IN VIEW OF the heavy thought that has recently gone into the question Is Humor Best for Us? I am happy to report that "Bringing Up Baby" is funny from the word go, that it has no other meaning to recommend it, nor therapeutic qualities, and that I wouldn't swap it for practically any three things of the current season. For comedy to be really good, of course, there is required something more in the way of total design than any random collection of hilarities. There must be point—not *a* point to be *made*, which is the easy goal of any literary tortoise, but a point from which to start, as implicit throughout as the center of a circle. "Bringing Up Baby" has something of the sort. The actual story goes into the troubles of a paleontologist who first offends a prospective angel for his museum, then his fiancée, and then gets into the wild-goose affairs of a girl and her leopard and terrier and other family members, ending up in jail and of course in love. That could be done in two reels. What puts the dramatic spirit into it is the character of the harebrained young thing who gets him mixed up in all this.

Katharine Hepburn builds the part from the ground, breathless, sensitive, headstrong, triumphant in illogic and serene in that bounding brassy nerve possible only to the very very well bred. Without the intelligence and mercury of such a study, the callous scheming of this bit of fluff would have left all in confusion and the audience howling for her blood. As it is, we merely accept and humor her, as one would a wife. Cary Grant does a nice job of underlining the situation; there is good support from Barry Fitzgerald, Walter Catlett, May Robson (the leopard was better than any of them, but is it art?). The film holds together by virtue of constant invention and surprise in the situations; and Howard Hawks's direction, though it could have been less heavy and more supple, is essentially that of film comedy. All of which could be elaborated, techniques analyzed, points cited, etc. But why? "Bringing Up Baby" is hardly a departure; it settles nothing; it is full of an easy inviting humor. So do you want to go or don't you.

There are several current films that I suppose ought to be mentioned in the comedy department, either because they try to be funny or because they try not. "The Goldwyn Follies—folly all right, in color, with Adolphe Menjou, Andrea Leeds, the Ritz Brothers and few else I want to remember—is some of it quite amusing and some of it awful. . . . "Marco Polo" is a fantastic bit of candy and something went wrong. It has Gary Cooper playing straight, Ernest Truex apparently playing a comic, the rest of the Hollywood natives playing subjects of the Khan. To make the rousing adventure its subject suggests, they should have junked most of the elaborate background and used some sense. . . . And there has been an idea going around that "A Slight Case of Murder" is a comedy (which it may be if comedy means a story of farce complexion with laughs coming at you from way down the track like a freight in a nightmare). The idea of a beer racketeer (Edward G. Robinson) going straight and getting innocently tied up with four cadavers and an affair between his daughter and a cop, still shows enough of the irresponsibly fantastic to have made the highest flight in humor. But it was directed by a truck driver, and if the mere sweating intention of its tired clatter has any life on the screen, then there is something of life I miss in the following image: Picture four grown men seriously occupied for fully two minutes in going through spasms of gagging, spitting and retching to establish the climactic and hilarious point that the beer, of which each has had one swallow, is not good-tasting beer. That's all.

Though hampered a little by a satirical point that is eccentric to the story, "Generals without Buttons" is a picture you could truly call sweet. At the Filmarte in New York—French with dialogue titles. The story (if not its awful prologue) goes in a breath: Two French villages are ancient enemies, one praying for the rain to grow its cabbages, the other for sun on its grapes. The new girl teacher finds the children fighting in gangs, and with the help of the neighboring mayor (young, naturally) brings about peace among them. The joint *fête* ends in an adult brawl with the kids looking on wisely, but fearing that when they grow up, even they may be just as foolish. It is simple, but pervaded with the take-your-time air around these tiny clusters of houses, hidden from the progress of time in their lovely countryside. And it simply runs over with the life of children, seen completely in the eternal double-existence of their secret world, in which there is so much more time and fervor for codes, ritual, high deeds.

There is a little play in the schoolroom and homes, but this story is occupied with councils of war, and skirmishes under a strategic leader. Capture by the enemy means the humiliation of having all your buttons cut off and how would you like that, let alone your parents? They try to fight naked, then get a scheme for hoarding all the but-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tons in the village—the girls, sending off their heroes as is the custom, will sew them on and they will be impregnable. The war is practically won when they take the enemy chief's pants off altogether, but the large matter of good pants lost in a poor village brings the elders in.

The kids are fine, so grave, wily and determined that the story keeps its suspense effortlessly. The director, Jacques Daroy, apparently had the talent to see that since his story depended on boys, the will to follow was a boy's will, and the thing to do was accept the children's code of values as perfectly natural until they were unselfconscious and interested, and then say, "All right, we're going to have a war for a bit," and start the cameras. The leading young ones have talent of course, but it is the just talent of expression through themselves, as opposed to the customary hobbling process of seeing a thing as they see their elders seeing them see it.

So the film does nicely, carrying its mild preachment along on a sort of natural delight. Outside of the envious squealer all of them are more brave and kind than might be found in life. But that is the solidarity of danger I suppose, and any suggestion of the goody-goody should be dispelled by the picture of the rearguard valiant up a tree, the enemy surrounding and stoning him and trying to beat him into saying the catchphrase of surrender, and he is saying everything else. For a climax he is stuck. *Et puis*, he screams at them, defiant and furious and blubbering openly, *et puis—et puis, merde!* OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

Our unemployed are not hard to pick out in any crowd. They are always in a good humor and generally they are whistling. There is something in the keen satisfaction of being unemployed that sets a fellow to whistling. Surely these are the people whom the gods love. These gods have laid their heavy yoke upon the rest of us. We work; they whistle. This would be a dull world if everybody would aworking go.—*Thomas Lomax Hunter, in The Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch.*

Children's Show. Continuous 5 P.M. to closing. Revealing for the first time the intimate life story of the Borgias. "Lucrezia Borgia" (English dialogue titles). "Hotter than 'Ecstacy.'—*W. Winchell*" – *Advertisement of the World Theatre, in The (New York) Daily Worker.*

But he explains the secret of his success was: "I took the teachings of Jesus, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham Lincoln and others and then streamlined them—so you advertising men and others could use them.—*Dale Carnegie, quoted in The Philadelphia Record.*

Innocents-Abroad Department

Monarchists, great landowners, rich manufacturers make up but a fraction of his [Franco's] support. Progressives as we should call them, follow him in great numbers, and tens of thousands of genuine radicals shout themselves hoarse in his honor.—*Ellery Sedgwick, editor of The Atlantic Monthly, writing in The New York Times.*

Boston Tea Party Carries On

Mrs. William A. Becker, president of the Daughters of the American Revolution, will discuss requirements for a presentation at the Court of St. James.—*From the radio column of The Toledo, O., News-Bee.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic.—THE EDITORS

A Communication

Hindus on Lyons

SIR: Your recent debate on "Assignment in Utopia" [The New Republic, December 29] raised some important issues involving Russia. At first I hesitated to take part in the discussion, because the author, Mr. Eugene Lyons, included me among a score of writers whom he attacked in his book and in the press. So far, save for a few words in The Saturday Review of Literature, I have never replied to personal attacks in print. If I make an exception in this case, it is in the hope of cutting through to more vital matters.

Mr. Lyons accuses me of "snubbing" the 1933 famine and of promising the Soviet authorities to avoid my native village, which "was in the heart of the stricken region." Actually, I discussed the famine at considerable length in some twenty lectures on my return to the United States in the fall of 1933. The Soviet authorities never demanded that I stay away from my native village, and I never made any promise to do so. Finally, my native village has not to my knowledge had a famine in all its history; it has had bread when other parts of Russia have starved.

I mention these details because they are typical of Mr. Lyons' method and essential to it. He assures us that before going to Russia he "unhesitatingly cast [his] lot with the communists." Yet he considered his United Press job an *assignment in Utopia*. Could any genuine communist fail to know that Marx, Engels and Lenin have excoriated the very word Utopia? Mr. Lyons assures us that he prepared himself for his task by reading "all the books on Russia." Which books? Blighted by three centuries of serfdom, slaughtered in a world war, slaughtered again in a civil war, devastated by a gruesome famine, ruled by a stern dictatorship with terror as an avowed weapon—could anyone knowing this expect such a country to be a Utopia? On the face of it, Mr. Lyons could not have come to Russia as a communist. He could not possibly have "read all the books on Russia." He came there ignorant of its past and its problems and set in his expectations; he left seeing it as an unrelieved nightmare of blood and terror.

I have known Tsarist and revolutionary Russia for years; I have lived in both. I have never been a communist, never looked for Utopias anywhere and never deliberately concealed unpleasant truths about Russia, as Mr. Lyons boasts he has. I have tried to study the facts through

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct contact and to report them to the best of my ability. What I find most shocking in Mr. Lyons' writing is that he has never made a serious attempt to come into real contact with workers in factories, peasants on farms, students in universities. You will search his book in vain for an account of a single night spent in the home of a worker or on a collective farm. Not one night on any collective farm. Mr. Lyons does not conceal his repugnance to meeting the Russian masses in their own milieu. When he travels third class he is so disgusted that he vows never willingly to repeat that experience. Evidently, a journalist in Russia has certain advantages in not being a communist like Mr. Lyons. Ralph Barnes of The New York Herald Tribune often accompanied me on trips to villages and he would never travel any other way than third class. He liked it immensely, and thought such direct contact invaluable to the understanding of the country.

It is therefore amusing to read Mr. Lyons' estimate of the foreign correspondent's calling. He reports: "'Are you a correspondent?' we liked to say to newcomers, 'Well, I'm a prostitute too.'" Who are "we"? I have known them well—John Gunther, Junius Wood, Negley Farson, Edgar Mowrer, Joseph Phillips, Walter Duranty, Otto D. Tolischus, H. R. Knickerbocker, Vincent Sheean, Ralph Barnes, James Mills, Joe Baird, Bill Stoneman, Stanley Richardson and others like them. A more incorruptible group of men never lived. I have never heard any of them refer to themselves as "prostitutes." Only Mr. Lyons has done so.

The crux of the whole matter lies in Mr. Lyons' willful disregard of the creative aspects of the Russian revolution. His comment on the Plan is that "one searches the records of mankind in vain for a more miserable return on a vast investment." Is it unimportant that it has thus far prevented Japan and Germany from carrying out their openly announced plan of attacking Russia? That it has saved Spain from going Fascist?

Equally significant is Mr. Lyons' fantastic ignorance of the achievements of collectivization. This "communist" who has "read all the books on Russia" does not seem to know that for over a thousand years Russia's basic problem has been bread. He does not understand that only now, under collectivization, with the introduction of machinery, science, irrigation, deep plowing and frequent cultivation, has Russia succeeded for the first time in forging an effective instrument against scarcity of bread.

Indeed, his book is an encyclopedia of omissions. Of the discovery of a vast world of natural resources, the conquest of the Arctic, the development of new regions, not a word; of the thousands of schools in factories where workers are taught to master machinery and to prepare for the university, of the remarkable spread of literacy and education, not a word; of the thousands of new maternity homes in cities and villages, of the emancipation of the peasant woman from the economic domination of man, not a word; of the provision for the first time in Russian history for the aged, the disabled and the orphans in the villages, of the amazingly successful settlement of Jews on the land, not a word. These and hundreds of other steps towards a new life which the masses have won, Mr. Lyons has cheerfully ignored. We are asked to believe that there is *nothing but blood and terror!*

I have never approved of the tyranny of the Revolution. Unlike Mr. Lyons, I was never ready to "liquidate classes, purge millions all for the cause." But I have tried to see beyond the destruction to the creative achievements of the Revolution, which are at least as important.

There is only one other man I know of who has "snubbed" these achievements as wantonly as Mr. Lyons. His name is Joseph Göbbels.

New York City MAURICE HINDUS

Correspondence

On Beard v. Browder

SIR: As a possessor of the liberal mind and as a fervent devotee of peace and democracy, I find myself baffled by Professor Beard's reply to Earl Browder in the debate on Collective Security (February 2). . . . In the face of the airplane and the operation of socio-economic forces, it is astonishing to find in Beard, the historian, that confidence in the effectiveness of the Atlantic Ocean as an insulator from Europe. . . . Is Beard unaware of the intimate relationship between the Brazilian Integralistas and European and Asiatic fascism? . . . If the liberal democrat does not desire America to become the penitentiary Germany has become, he must drop his social isolation and join with the organized working class against the enemies of democracy. . . .

New York City ISIDOR EDELMAN

SIR: A word of thanks for Dr. Beard's stirring reply to Mr. Browder. Like many Americans, I've been swinging back and forth in an effort to reach a rational decision about collective security before the possibility for a rational choice disappears. It's comforting to read a statement so cogent that you know, finally, where you stand. Or almost know. Dr. Beard has convinced me that America's participation in a world war is not justified by any talk of democracy or international morality; that what is going on is a struggle for power and economic advantage. But, strictly on this level, is it a good policy for us to stay out? . . . Will we not be the next victims in their [the Fascists'] march to world hegemony? . . . I realize that is a question of future contingencies and that anyone's answer is bound to be a guess. But probably no one is better equipped to make a good guess than Dr. Beard.

Chicago, Ill. SIMON O. LESSER

SIR: . . . Dr. Beard constantly refers to the imperialist war of 1914. I should like to remind him that the world of today is vastly different. First, one-sixth of the world is a socialist republic, the Soviet Union. France, Spain, China, the United States and Mexico have moved politically to the Left, toward greater democracy and the possibility of socialism in the not too remote future, provided the Fascist drive toward reaction can be stopped. If the Loyalists can free Spain and if China can drive the Japanese entirely out of their country (and this can be done with the support of the democratic countries) a big step toward peace and socialism will be made.

Los Angeles, Calif. OLIVER GREENE

SIR: . . . This realistic reply of Beard's is worthy of immediate and widespread consumption. . . . Please forward copies to that group of church leaders who . . . speaking out of bafflement and frustration and the sense of inadequacy to provide intelli-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gent leadership, as well as being afraid to show moral passion over rank injustices here at home lest they lose face and support at the hands of a system for which the church is a convenient ditto mark, now indulge vigorously, self-righteously and hypocritically in compensatory rationalizations in faraway sympathy for the poor Chinese, the mission property, and urge loyalty to save the Open Door which everywhere prevails in China for the Gospel. . . .

West Branch, Mich. W. J. DUDGEON

SIR: . . . War between fascism and world democracy is ultimately inevitable. Nothing can prevent it except a worldwide surrender of freedom. . . . America may postpone this conflict until the success of her fascist adversaries encourages them to try out her armed power, but she would be foolhardy to do so. . . .

Fresno, Calif. W. R. ARRINGTON

SIR: A criminal is one who violates a law supposedly resting on the foundations of justice. . . . The "aggressor" nations today are violators of laws founded in the principles of justice as formulated by an imperialistic world, admittedly a society of nations acting in accordance with the policies of acquisition and greed. . . . Hence to call upon the peaceful imperialisms to act in concert against the aggressor imperialisms may end in the defeat of the latter but not in the end of imperialism. . . .

Brooklyn, N. Y. MICHAEL WOOLF

Cantwell v. Stolberg

SIR: Mr. Cantwell's article in your issue of February 23 on "The Communists and the CIO" has little to do with either. It is a featured attack on my series on the CIO (which for some reason he calls a "pamphlet") in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. What Mr. Cantwell does is to rewrite, demonstrably and point by point, the arguments which appeared in The Daily Worker. He even picks up the canard that The San Francisco News ran a different version of my story on the West Coast maritime situation, presumably because I couldn't fool San Franciscans. The San Francisco News did nothing of the kind, and said so. It printed the same story which appeared in twenty-two other Scripps-Howard papers. Only one of the papers failed to make the two or three unimportant corrections I had handed in the day before. Space forbids enumeration of other such irresponsible statements by Mr. Cantwell.

For the sake of brevity and logic, I will divide Mr. Cantwell's attack into three parts. He accuses me (1) of having written "the most thoroughgoing attack on the CIO that has appeared"; (2) he refers throughout to my many factual errors; (3) and he calls me a lot of names.

(1) In his first accusation, he accepts the Stalinist assumption that to attack the Communist Party is to attack the CIO; that my wholehearted endorsement of the CIO is but a trick; and implies that my series discussed nothing but factionalism. This enables Mr. Cantwell to play the typical Stalinoid trick of coupling my name with Hague, Girdler and Sokolsky. But he omits, partly by design and partly through lack of information, the following really significant developments.

At their last convention, representing 400,000 men, the United Mine Workers, which means in this case John L. Lewis, dramatically reaffirmed an old and forgotten constitutional provision prohibiting membership in the Communist Party. Homer Martin and David Dubinsky, heading 650,000 workers, came out openly and unequivocally in the daily press against Stalinist disruption. Philip Murray and the other leaders of 400,000 steel workers are discharging, as a deliberate tactic, Stalinist organizers. The West Coast Firemen have recently voted out of office their leaders as "Stalinist stooges." Over half of the CIO, including *all* the unions in the basic industries, have come out officially against Stalinist factionalism, exactly on the grounds I discussed in my series. Obviously, to Mr. Cantwell, Messrs. Lewis, Dubinsky, Martin, Clint Golden, Phil Murray, etc., are all "thoroughgoing" enemies of the CIO.

Moreover, it so happens that my research for the series was constantly checked by CIO officials, though of course I alone am responsible for what I wrote. Four union presidents read my copy before it appeared. At least a dozen other high CIO officials read, as experts, individual articles, and kept me in constant touch with the developing situation. Two of the most powerful unions put their research departments at my complete disposal. And they did all this from the moral conviction that the story had to be told, as it was told at this time.

(2) It is precisely because of all this splendid help that the number of factual errors in this series was kept down to a minimum. I made four errors of fact. And here they are:

Though the ILGWU informed me that it had contributed to the CIO "between $300,000 and $400,000," I mistakenly put down $600,000.

I called Charles S. Zimmerman, vice-president of the ILGWU, Alexander Zimmerman. (To his friends Mr. Zimmerman is known as Sasha, which is a diminutive of Alexander.)

I stated that the State, County and Municipal Workers, which I treated very briefly, belongs to a group of three unions, "whose administrations are not Communist. . . . " This particular union is completely in the control of Stalinist officials.

I stated that only a year ago the United Textile Workers had 30,000 members. Mr. James Starr, secretary-treasurer of the union, claims that they had 65,000 members. He includes some 40,000 members of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, a completely autonomous group within the UTW, holding their own conventions and electing their own national officers. They are not usually included when one speaks of the textile workers. But Mr. Starr is technically correct.

There are no other factual errors in the entire series.

(3) Mr. Cantwell's personal opinions about me, and his critical opinions about the labor movement, do not interest me. They do not tempt my "gift for invective."

New York City BENJAMIN STOLBERG

SIR: I did not say or imply in my article that The San Francisco News printed a different version of Mr. Stolberg's article. I said that it omitted passages attacking Bridges and that an editorial comment observed that Stolberg had been less than fair to Bridges. This information I got from a source that had previously been reliable; I have, however, written for the issue of The San Francisco News in question; as soon as it arrives I will answer this point in Mr. Stolberg's letter.

Mr. Stolberg admits four errors in his series. There were others. He said, for example, that the Transport Workers' Union had 70,000 members when it approached the A. F. of L. for affiliation. It joined the International Association of Machinists when its membership was 3,000. This apparently minor point throws considerable light on the union's subsequent relationship with the A. F. of L. In his account of the Saginaw Power strike Mr. Stolberg described Kempton Williams as an adventurer, a former member of the Progressive Miners, and accused him of calling the strike in response to the urgencies of the Communist Party "line." Williams was in Washington when the strike took place, has not been a Progressive Miner, is a Socialist and has written a convincing denial of the charge that he is an adventurer. This example, incidentally, is a clear illustration of the dangers involved in Stolberg's approach to these problems. Mr. Stolberg has not answered Kempton Williams' defense. But Mr. Francis Henson, assistant to Homer Martin of the United Automobile Workers, while admitting that Mr. Stolberg was incorrect, has asserted that Kempton Williams was nevertheless responsible for what happened in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saginaw despite the fact that he was in Washington, since he "tended to encourage unauthorized strike action." Obviously you can argue along these lines forever, and just as obviously you can make such writing as Mr. Stolberg's an instrument in factional disputes.

For that reason I did not emphasize these and other errors in "Inside the CIO." It seems to me to be consistent with Mr. Stolberg's approach that he should be concerned about the name of the vice-president of one union, while distorting the whole picture of the CIO's growth. I did, however, call his series the most thoroughgoing attack on the CIO that has appeared. In view of his pictures of corruption and intrigue in the CIO unions, I do not see how it can be considered otherwise. Mr. Stolberg implies in his letter that John Lewis, Philip Murray and other CIO officials have endorsed his series and says that "four union presidents" read his copy, while a dozen other leaders gave expert opinion on individual sections. Who are these leaders? Has John Lewis endorsed the picture of the CIO that is drawn in "Inside the CIO"? Or Sidney Hillman? Or Philip Murray? It has been attacked, and very effectively attacked, by John Brophy and others, but no CIO leader has publicly endorsed it.

I did not say or imply that Mr. Stolberg's endorsement of the CIO was a trick. The trouble lies far deeper than mere trickery. The point of my article was that the backwardness of American labor writing makes it possible for partisan attacks like Mr. Stolberg's to appear. In this connection, Mr. Stolberg's moral conviction that "the story had to be told at this time" is interesting. He has been suffering from this moral conviction for a long time. Back in 1925 he was suffering from it, and writing along the same line in "The Peter Pans of Communism." The American labor movement has changed since that time, but Mr. Stolberg's writing has not, nor has the type of labor journalism that he represents.

New York City ROBERT CANTWELL

SIR: In undertaking the correction of some of Benjamin Stolberg's inaccuracies, Robert Cantwell, in your issue of February 23, refers to other corrections of Stolberg by newspapers which printed his series, "Inside the CIO." The Cleveland News, he says, editorially corrected errors in Stolberg's history of the Newspaper Guild.

The only Cleveland newspaper which printed Stolberg's series was The Cleveland Press. The Cleveland Press did publish a correction in reference to the early history of the Newspaper Guild, and I do not know of any other correction published in any other Cleveland newspaper.

Cleveland, O. A. T. BURCH, Editor, The Cleveland Press

SIR: In your issue of February 23, Mr. Robert Cantwell refers to the fact that Benjamin Stolberg's book, "Inside the CIO," will be issued by the Vanguard Press.

Originally the announcement was made that Vanguard would publish this book, but Mr. Stolberg has changed his plans in this regard and his book will be issued by another house.

New York City JAMES HENLE

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Byron R. Hubbard of Berkeley, California, endorses Upton Sinclair's project of making a film out of "The Flivver King" (in Correspondence, February 23) and suggests that a corporation be set up for the purpose of obtaining the necessary capital. Mr. Hubbard promises to take stock worth $100 and will undertake to distribute an additional five thousand dollars' worth. . . . Apropos of the editorial "What Uncle Got for His Money" (March 2), Herbert Bruncken of Milwaukee writes of the interesting WPA work of indexing and microfilming the issues of The Milwaukee Sentinel from 1900 to 1937.

William E. Chancellor writes from Norwood, Ohio, to take issue with the phrase "the futility of war." War, he thinks, has accomplished a great deal and besides "Quarrel is part and parcel of the human psyche." . . . Joseph Manlet of Cleveland Heights, Ohio, joins in the debate between Stephen Rich and Kenneth Mueller (January 19 and February 3) over the demand for a good and cheap four-cylinder automobile. The reason there is none such, says Mr. Manlet, is the competition offered by the second-hand-car market. . . . A. Ogle of New York City complains about C. E. Ayres's review of "What Man Has Made of Man," by Mortimer Adler (February 16) What the review lacked, in his opinion, was a clear statement of one or several of the directing principles of Thomism with a specific explanation of how and where and when it does not apply to the problems of contemporary civilization.

Readers in the New York City area may be interested in two events connected with National Sharecroppers' Week. The first is a luncheon, Saturday, March 12, at Rosoff's restaurant, where Norman Thomas, Roy Wilkins and J. Raymond Walsh will speak. The second is two benefit performances of "Pins and Needles" on Sunday afternoon and evening, March 13. Reservations may be had at the Workers' Defense League, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City. . . . Cyril Clemens of Webster Groves, Missouri, is writing a biography of Lytton Strachey and wishes that New Republic readers with information about him would write. . . . Ephraim Schwartzman, executive secretary of the Jewish People's Committee, 1123 Broadway, New York City, writes about the National Unity Convention which will be held on March 12 and 13 in New York City for the purpose of unifying the various Jewish groups in the United States for joint action against anti-Semitism and fascism in general.

David Lasser, president of the Workers' Alliance of America, writes from Washington, D. C., about the National Conference on Work and Security to be held in Washington on March 19 and 20. The purpose of the meeting is to formulate a program to present to Congress on the question of what to do about the 13,000,000 unemployed. Invitations have been issued to more than two hundred craft and industrial unions and civic, social welfare, church and farm organizations.

What's on the Air?

Dr. Mordecai Ezekiel and Norman Thomas speak on the occasion of National Sharecroppers' Week, Friday, March 11, 10:45 P.M., CBS.

Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, speaks on "Why Go to College?" Saturday, March 12, 2:15 P.M., CBS.

Postmaster General James Farley gives his St. Patrick's Day address, Thursday, March 17, 10:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Musical programs of the week include the Metropolitan Opera Company broadcast of "Lucia di Lammermoor" with Lily Pons, Saturday, March 12, 1:55 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; the Chicago Symphony Orchestra conducted by Hans Lange, Saturday, March 12, 9:15 P.M., Mutual; the NBC Symphony conducted by Carlos Chavez, Saturday, March 12, 10 P.M., NBC-Red Network; Josef Hoffman, guest artist with the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, Sunday, March 13, 3 P.M., CBS; the Philadelphia Orchestra conducted by Eugene Ormandy, Monday, March 14, 9 P.M., Blue Network; and the Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra conducted by José Iturbi, Thursday, March 17, 8:45 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

All times given are Eastern Standard Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Golden Legend

1. And Joseph was brought down to Egypt; and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, bought him off the hands of the Ishmaelites, which had brought him down thither.

2. And the Lord was with Joseph, and he was a prosperous man; and he was in the house of his master the Egyptian.

ALMOST the whole plot of "Joseph in Egypt"[1] is contained in the first twenty verses of Genesis 39. It is true that Mann has borrowed several details from other versions of the Joseph legend—from that in the Koran, for example. But for the most part he confines himself to the familiar story of how Joseph was sold into Potiphar's household, how he became the chief steward there, how he was tempted by Potiphar's wife, how he was falsely accused and how, in the end, "Joseph's master took him, and put him into the prison, a place where the king's prisoners were bound." I have emphasized the adverb "how," remembering Mann's apology for telling the story at such great length. "Let no one think I am deaf to the reproach," he says, ". . . that the laconic terseness of the original text cannot be surpassed, and that my whole enterprise, which is already of such long continuance, is so much labor lost. But . . . is there not as much dignity and importance attached to the discussion of the 'how' as to the transmission of the 'what?' Yes, does not life first fulfill itself in the 'how'?" Here lies the key to Mann's purpose. In expanding twenty verses of Genesis into a novel of 664 pages, bound in two volumes, he is trying to find the "how" that restores life to the Joseph legend and reveals it as part of our own experience.

This novel—or let us say the whole unfinished series of which it forms a part—is among the few masterpieces of our time. The word "great" that is so often misapplied can be used this time without embarrassment. But its greatness is not veiled in Orphic mystery. Mann makes no attempt to hide his theories of writing or his standards of workmanship; he is almost too willing to discuss them with his readers. In trying to revivify the story of Joseph, he has followed four methods which other writers can follow too—if they have the same breadth of understanding and the same infinite capacity for taking pains.

His first method is one that biblical scholars have been using for at least a thousand years. He analyzes the text; he seizes upon its implications and tries to make them clear. Thus, the Bible says of Joseph, "he was in the house of his master the Egyptian." Why hadn't he been sent into his master's fields, to work and die under the lash with most of the other slaves? Mann finds the answer both in Joseph's character and in that of Potiphar's overseer, a new figure introduced into the story without disturbing its outlines. The Bible says of Potiphar's wife, "she spake to Joseph day by day." Mann develops this hint of continued action into a picture of slow moral disintegration. There are parts of the novel that apparently refer to modern Europe, but usually they are based on suggestions in the original narrative. Thus, Potiphar's wife makes a Jew-baiting speech to the men of her household. But she had made that speech in the Bible too. "See," she said, holding up Joseph's torn garment, "he hath brought in an Hebrew unto us to mock us." It was not Thomas Mann who imagined her talking like Goering at the Reichstag fire trial; it was the author of the Pentateuch.

But analysis of the text will carry him only so far; and where it stops Mann has to depend on a second familiar method—that is, on the novelist's talent for creating characters. Here he is on dangerous ground; he is approaching the sort of "fictionized biography" that might be defined as biography simplified and conventionalized by fiction. We have a lord to depict: let us make him lordly. Our hero is tempted: let us make the woman a temptress like Cleopatra. But Mann is a novelist much too subtle to fall into such a trap. Besides playing their proper roles in the story—and playing them superbly—his characters are in themselves complex, human and convincing. Potiphar, the great lord, is captain of the king's guard, but his office is a sinecure. Essentially he is powerless; his splendid career is built wholly on appearances. In the midst of them is a lonely, uneasy man trying to hide the secret that he has been emasculated by his parents, who offered his manhood as a sacrifice to the gods. His wife, Mut-em-enet, known to her friends as Eni, is cool, beautiful, indifferent, a virgin dedicated to the service of the temple. But when she falls in love with Joseph, her pride is broken and her character begins to degenerate, month by month. Even her body changes, till at the end—but only at the end—she becomes a furious hag.

These characters, modern in conception, are set against a definite historical background which also suggests the modern world. Mann imagines that Joseph was sold into Egypt during the reign of Amenhotep III, at the end of the eighteenth dynasty. It was a time when the Egyptian empire, which had reached its height a century before, was rapidly declining: the Hittites were attacking from the northeast; the desert tribes were drifting into Palestine. At home there was a bitter conflict between the priests' party—the bitter nationalists, the reactionaries, the worshipers of Amon—and the king's party of internationalists who worshiped Aton the Sun as the only true god. This conflict burst forth into civil war during the reign of Ikhnaton (Profitable-to-Aton), the next Pharaoh and the one who would release Joseph from prison. As a foreigner and a leader in the king's party, Joseph would be deeply involved in Egyptian politics—which in sober truth were not unlike the German politics of our own century.

But Mann has a fourth method of adding richness and weight to his story. Continually he draws on a field of modern thought that lies on the borderland between science

[1] Joseph in Egypt, by Thomas Mann. Translated by H. T. Lowe-Porter. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 2 vols., $5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and speculation. Freud and the Gestalt school, in their different branches of psychology; Frazer and Burkheim, in their outlines of primitive religion; Spengler, in his "morphology of history"—all these men had something in common, no matter how deep their conflicts. All of them were seeking for patterns or configurations or forms of experience, rather than for causes in the strict logical sense of the word. Mann borrows some of their theories, psychological or anthropological, but chiefly he uses their general attitude. To him the story of Joseph is a master pattern of human experience. It includes the episodes that recur in other legends—the miraculous birth, the strife among brothers, the descent into the pit (a symbolic death), the wandering in exile, the tempting, the labors, the triumph. In a sense it repeats the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (not to mention Osiris, Tammuz, Adonis). In another sense it foreshadows the adventures of heroes in our modern world.

There is a great deal more to be said about Mann's novel; next week I hope to discuss it further. This week I have only one more point to make. By all the methods I have briefly discussed—analytical, fictional, historical and morphological—the author enriches his story without necessarily bringing it any nearer to the Joseph-who-lived. But did he ever live? On that point, tradition is eloquent while history holds its tongue. Joseph may have been a slave in Egypt under the Hyksos, the Shepherd Kings, three hundred years before the date that Mann has chosen. He may have been several figures, vaguely remembered and merged into one by the Hebrew story-tellers; or he may have been a culture-hero who never existed on earth. For Mann's purpose, it doesn't really matter. What he is seeking is not the Joseph-who-lived but rather the legend that has never died—the legend repeated through the centuries and shaped by popular wisdom, so that even in its errors it reflects the living nature of man. MALCOLM COWLEY

Napoleon in the Clinic

Napoleon: A Doctor's Biography, by Boris Sokoloff. New York: Prentice-Hall. 303 pages. $3.25.
The Riddle of Napoleon, by Raoul Brice. Translated by Basil Creighton. New York: Putnam's. 341 pages. $3.75.

THE PHYSIQUE, personality and character of the dictator is a concrete political category. Of course the fundamental causes of dictatorship far transcend the personal factor. The regime of Napoleon I is inconceivable apart from the French Revolution, Thermidor and the revolutionary wars, and the regime of his nephew Napoleon III apart from the failure of the Revolution of 1848. In our own day, the rise of Hitler and Mussolini cannot be dissociated from the background of war and defeat, economic crisis and demoralization. It is none the less a fact that when, for whatever ultimate reasons, a government is consciously and formally integrated around a single personality, the grip of the dictator and the public image of his presumed abilities become vital conditions of his continued rule. If he is a military leader he cannot afford to lose wars; if he is a political leader he cannot afford to suffer defeat in the diplomatic and political field, or to take the blame for defeat. Failure of physical, nervous or mental powers is a luxury and privilege exclusively enjoyed, and frequently abused, by hereditary monarchs and by figureheads, and none of the dictators is a mere figurehead.

So closely did Napoleon and his system become intertwined that the revival of the system under the Second Empire took the form of the resurrection and beatification of the "Napoleonic myth." It is therefore natural that many students should be fascinated by the relation between his character and the path of his physical development and the ups and downs of his career. The difficulty is that the author who would shed light on this problem must possess a double equipment of medical and historical science. The present authors are physicians but not historians.

Dr. Sokoloff plumbs all the pitfalls of a narrow medical interpretation of the problem. It seems that the star of the dictator rose with the hyperactivity of his endocrine glands in his twenties and thirties and fell with endocrine hypoactivity in his forties. It is a well known fact that Napoleon's physical and nervous energies indeed declined after 1808-09, but Dr. Sokoloff has not established its bearing upon the decline of his political power. The glandular hypothesis is subject to two crushing discounts in this particular case. The rise of Napoleon was made possible by the whole victorious sweep of French arms which began in 1792-93, or long before his glands obtained their first command in Italy in 1796. Dr. Sokoloff blandly ignores the socio-military factors which enabled not only Napoleon but literally dozens of French generals—or rather their armies—to win great victories almost consistently for a generation. Then, too, Dr. Sokoloff fails to notice, let alone explain, the energy frequently displayed by Napoleon after his glands had come upon evil days, notably in his brilliant, and yet futile, campaign of 1814. Napoleon may have been suffering in his later years from digestive cramps and endocrine disturbances, but he was also suffering from more important disturbances in Spain and Russia, to mention but two of many foci of infection in his body politic.

Dr. Brice, who is a Surgeon Lieutenant-General in the French Army, was better advised to seek for an explanation of some of Napoleon's drives and characteristics in his Corsican background and culture rather than in his physical condition. One can easily make too much of this factor, as Dr. Brice does when he asserts that the long struggle with Great Britain was conducted by Napoleon in the spirit of a personal vendetta—"the most relentless vendetta in all history." But it is true that the Corsican origin helps to account for Napoleon's extraordinary indulgence toward his family, his tribalism and clannishness, and his superstitions. The emphasis upon his superstitions, however, would seem less exaggerated if the reader did not discover, to his dismay, that the good doctor is himself a prey to some horrible imaginings. He thinks that "the soul emits a force" and cannot rid himself of the feeling that there may, after all, be something in portents, signs, fates and perhaps even in astrology. Believe it or not, the doctor also suspects that Napoleon was divine or at least is not yet exactly dead. The damned thing must give him nightmares: "The magical force of his soul has not given out; it survives his mortal part in an extraordinary way"—"Try as one may to keep Napoleon within human proportions, one cannot succeed altogether. There is a point where he escapes all bounds."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although, to be quite fair, Dr. Brice shows greater understanding of his subject than does Dr. Sokoloff, their books belong on the overcrowded shelves of Napoleonic mythology. The persistence and virulence of the cult of Napoleon are a measure of the sound popular sense of the distance that separates him from his later imitators. But they are also a measure of the limited imagination and knowledge of the cultists. SOLOMON F. BLUM

Napoleon and His Son, by Pierre Nezeloff. Translated by Warre Bradley Wells. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation. 474 pages. $3.

"Napoleon and His Son" is a fictionalized and much too romanticized account of the relation of Napoleon to his second wife Marie Louise and their son, the short-lived Duke of Reichstadt. Nezeloff turns up interesting material on the private life of this ill assorted family, especially on the distaff side. His sober judgment of the indifferent and stupid Hapsburg princess contrasts sharply with the prostrate adulation of the two men. Unconvincingly, the author depicts the "Eaglet" as consumed by the ambition to emulate his father on the battlefield and in the throne-room. Napoleon acts the doting husband and overfond father, both strange roles for a man who admitted, in a moment of keen and honest self-analysis, that he had never loved any human being. S. F. B.

Farm on the Equator

Out of Africa, by Isak Dinesen. New York: Random House. 389 pages. $2.75.

KENYA COLONY is the most fashionable of Britain's possessions in Africa; it shares with India a social standing denied by Colonel Blimp to colonies generally, and so attracts to its farms and well stocked hunting grounds a greater number of younger, restless Blimps short of foothold in the mother country. And its Negro castes are particularly numerous; it has drawn merchants from India and Arabia and Mohammedans from the north to share the country with its many distinctive native tribes —which vary from the Masai, a dying nomadic warrior race living on milk and blood, down to the Kikuyu, the gentle original inhabitants who, in the best African tradition, are now neatly segregated in reserves or living on the white farms as squatters. These many races, their environment, the animals with which they share it, and unattached wanderers from other lands make most of the material for Isak Dinesen's account of life in East Africa.

The outstanding feature of this book is the study of the native tribes around the author's farm. Inevitably the hard line betwen black and white in Africa shows up, but with none of the pompous generalizing so common to the white settler when he describes the (to him) comic dignity of the native and his beliefs. And while the author rarely discusses her topics from a directly sociological angle, her points are all the more telling by reason of the soundness of her indirect approach. Native laws and customs; the place of the white in the black man's life; the black's views on civilization; the importance of cattle not only in his economic life but in the righting of wrongs and the shaping of his attitude toward life; his relation to the seasons and to life and death—these are not listed in stuffy categories but emerge clearly and naturally out of accounts of everyday occurrences. The story moves in clear, quiet prose from the author's early African days to the selling and breaking-up of her farm eight years later; its unpretentiousness and sense are particularly impressive and never is there any falling back upon obvious, bring-'em-back-alive anecdotes to awe the foreign reader. RICHARD VAUGHAN

Why China Fights

I Speak for the Chinese, by Carl Crow. New York: Harper and Brothers. 92 pages. $1.
The First Act in China, by James M. Bertram. New York: The Viking Press. 306 pages. $3.

CARL CROW speaks for the Chinese because he likes the Chinese and because he dislikes the Japanese. The author of "400 Million Customers," who has just shown his smiling understanding for everything Chinese, follows up his success with this vigorous little book. Condensed into ninety pages, he gives twenty years of Far Eastern history —from a very definite point of view. China's struggle for unity, Japan's consistency in thwarting this development on every possible occasion, the emergence of Chiang Kai-shek as a leader, and the carefully timed last push on the part of the Japanese: all this is told brilliantly and supported by facts, some of which are revealed for the first time.

Despite the aim of the book, which is propaganda, Mr. Crow does not indulge in one-sided accusations against the aggressor. He introduces the Japanese as a people who are "misunderstood and will continue to be." Japan, to Mr. Crow, "still is a kind of Gilbert and Sullivan country in which the *most* unaccountable things happen." The Japanese mind centers around the Emperor, the "god who eats, sleeps, gets sick and dies," and if the glory of the Emperor can be advanced by breaking a treaty, then "that is the honorable thing to do." This strange code, which may justify the Japanese in their own eyes, confronts the world with a nation whose destiny it seems to be to run amok; and Mr. Crow drives home a very tangible warning to those "peace-at-any-price Americans who virtuously sidestep present problems for future generations to settle."

The fantastic story of the Sian mutiny, starting with the kidnaping of China's generalissimo on a frozen mountain slope and ending with the apologies of the kidnaper, "Young Marshal" Chang Hsueh-liang, has come to be considered the turning point in pre-war Chinese history. Yet precise information has been scanty, as the scene of the kidnaping was effectively "blockaded." Mr. Bertram happened to be the only foreign journalist who got through to Sian, and "The First Act in China" is the dynamic report of an often bewildered eye-witness.

Out of the ocean of treason and intrigue, there emerge the figures of the overconfident generalissimo and his more patriotic than disciplined subordinate. The opinions of the two men had clashed before on the one vital issue in Chinese policies: whether to pardon the Communists and to integrate them into a vast, anti-Japanese front, or to continue the fatiguing and hopeless struggle against them. The generalissmo, badly advised, "maintained that unification of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country must precede any kind of action against Japan; and unification meant to him forcible suppression of the Red Armies." To convince him of his mistaken attitude in the face of Japan's growing aggression, the Young Marshal abducted Chiang, and in the solitude of his imprisonment the generalissimo had a chance to reconsider his policy. China's united front was the result; and the stage was set for the great war which found Chiang's soldiers fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Reds.

This is one of the best books in the present flood of literature on the Far East. Mr. Bertram's photographs are beautiful, especially the snapshot of the little farmer's boy in the uniform of the Communist Army—the "shock-brigadier" who does not smile. ERNEST O. HAUSER

A Counter to Confusion

A Philosophy for a Modern Man, by H. Levy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 315 pages. $2.50.

THE DISCOVERY of the physical Principle of Uncertainty by W. Heisenberg in 1927 gave a shock to many scientists. The principle arises from certain roles of atomicity and chance in the nature of matter, which were discovered by Planck and Rutherford thirty years ago. It indicates that the position and motion of a particle cannot be determined exactly at any moment, for beyond a definite limit the attempt to reduce the inaccuracy in the determination of the position increases the inaccuracy in the determination of the motion, and vice versa. Thus, in terms of the ordinary ideas of position and motion there is always an irreducible element of uncertainty in the behavior of all material particles.

The clear recognition of this result in 1927 had remarkable effects. Some scientists of great eminence suggested that the physical uncertainty in the behavior of matter endowed it with a sort of free will. At the end of his work on "The Nature of the Physical World" Eddington virtually claimed that it is permissible to believe anything one likes, because the behavior of matter cannot be determined exactly, in the traditional meaning of determination. This conclusion was followed by a worldwide outburst of animistic thinking, which has strengthened reactionary philosophy nearly everywhere.

As Professor Levy explains in his book, this was a bitter result for those scientists who had been hoping that science would provide the solution to the social and personal problems of humanity. They had expected that the inspiration to improve human life would be provided by the continued triumphs of science, and were dismayed when they saw those triumphs being used to demean human powers and undermine human confidence. Professor Levy felt that a corrective to these derogatory works was urgently necessary, so he has given in this book an examination of the philosophical implications of recent scientific discoveries and other aspects of contemporary thought.

By means of his method of isolates he explains that the pessimistic conclusions of so many recent writers on science are due to philosophical mistakes. Science proceeds by isolating a phenomenon and studying it in isolation. This method gives significant results only when such isolation is permissible. If a phenomenon cannot be examined in isolation it is not a subject of science. For instance, if a single molecule of a gas is isolated it is no longer a subject of science as a gas, because it cannot form a gas apart from other molecules. As Niels Bohr has pointed out, the logical difficulties due to the atomicity of nature are exactly the same as those which arise in the definition of a melody. If a sequence of notes is subdivided beyond a definite limit it loses meaning. In Professor Levy's terminology, there is a limit beyond which the notes cannot be significantly isolated.

It does not follow that because the moon may be studied as an isolate or independent body, an electron should always be susceptible of investigation as an independent body. It is forgotten that the first view is acquired from experience, and that there is no necessary reason why the method which works with the moon should work with the indefinitely small objects of the sub-atomic world.

Besides giving a rough but sound basis for a materialist conception of the most awkward apparent paradoxes of modern physics, Professor Levy uses his method with great utility in his analysis of the philosophy of the social sciences. He shows that the logical difficulties in the philosophy of quantum physics and in the theory of social science are remarkably similar. His book is a valuable contribution to the counter-attack on the modern confusionists, and provides the ordinary man with formidable protection against them. It would be still more valuable if it were easier to read. The meaning of quite simple sentences is often obscured by an excess of words. The argument would be more striking if the style were leaner.

J. G. CROWTHER

Dodd on Democracy

The Old South: Struggles for Democracy, by William E. Dodd. New York: The Macmillan Company. 312 pages. $3.75.

WITH THIS VOLUME Professor Dodd begins a series intended to do for the Southern colonies what historians from Fiske to Morison and Andrews have done for New England. This first volume sets forth the battle for self-government in Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas in the seventeenth century. There were three parties to the struggle, the English government, the proprietors or grantees from the Crown, and the settlers. Virginia as the oldest of the colonies took the lead, and in 1676 launched the first civil war in the colonies in Bacon's Rebellion, a revolt against the misgovernment of Governor Berkeley. In Maryland the friction was chiefly between the settlers and the Calverts, who had been granted the land by Charles I to serve as a refuge for the persecuted Catholics and their followers. The Carolinas were likewise a grant to a group of favorities of Charles II. Difficulties between the settlers and the proprietors grew out of the effort to restrict the former to the lands controlled by the latter for which rent could be collected. Friction between the settlers and London arose from the fixing of prices for colonial products and the limiting of trade to the home market. The solution of these difficulties the settlers sought in a persistent demand for self-government. "These men proclaimed the right of self-government, freedom of conscience, free trade with the world 'as Englishmen have enjoyed,' and the right to bargain with the Indians for land and thus escape the payment

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEWSPAPERMAN'S NEWSPAPER

THE GUILD REPORTER
Organ of the American Newspaper Guild, An Outstanding White-Collar Union.

—★—

"A NEWSPAPERMAN'S NEWSPAPER" is the trade term proudly used by publishers whose papers become the favorite reading matter of newspapermen themselves.

The Guild Reporter is the real newspaperman's newspaper. As the official organ of the American Newspaper Guild, it is edited for and controlled and read by the working newspaper men and women of the United States and Canada.

The Guild Reporter has an interest reaching beyond its own organizational activities. It reports and analyzes underlying trends and developments in both the labor movement and in the newspaper industry. Serving no interest except the welfare of its members and the labor movement, it is exceptionally free to comment and report realistically on fundamentals. Some of its recent articles and reports have been:

"*'I Am the Law,' Says Hague—And He Is!*" an analysis of Mayor Hague's position, showing his strength and growing weaknesses. (Published December 6.)

"*The Growing Gap Between Press and People*" —Important revelations of what the papers failed to report when attacking Justice Black, made in the course of an analysis of the characteristics that are separating newspapers from popular interests. A speech by Irving Brant, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Star-Times.

"*The Country's Biggest Propaganda Machine,*" How the National Manufacturers Association spends its annual propaganda budget of $500,000.

"*Trends That Promise New Newspapers,*" an article by Ferdinand Lundberg.

Other notable material published recently includes:

Documentary evidence of the low ethical standards of the New York Publishers Association as shown by the attitude of its members toward the New York Herald Tribune's recent widely criticized Cuban section.

A speech by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association's chief union-buster before the association's recent closed meeting, advising his clients to "pare down your staffs."

Besides this material, the Guild's own organizational news gives an absorbing picture of the work of this pioneer white-collar union, which has shown a phenomenal growth in four years.

Subscription:
$3.50 A YEAR
Payable in Advance

SPECIAL RATES FOR SCHOOLS

Trial Subscription:
13 WEEKS FOR $1

GUILD REPORTER, NR
1560 Broadway, N. Y. C.

Enclosed find check for $3.50 for 1 year (or $1 for 13 weeks).

Name.....
Address.....
City.....
State.....

of quit-rents: the land belonged to those who improved it."

Professor Dodd outlines clearly the influence upon colonial development of events in Europe, especially the wars for commercial supremacy between the Dutch and the English which began under Cromwell and continued under Charles II. The result of England's triumph was to exclude the Dutch from trade with the colonies, to the disadvantage and discontent of the colonists. The civil war and the change in government from monarchy to republic and thence to dictatorship, and in ecclesiastical control from episcopacy to presbytery, had less effect in the colonies than might be expected, probably because the rulers had their hands full at home. The three-cornered exchange which grew up among the sugar islands, the New England colonies and the Southern colonies, based upon slaves, rum and tobacco, laid the foundation for later unity between the South and North in defense of trade. Altogether Professor Dodd has begun an informing and illuminating study of the sources of those political ideals of which he is so conspicuous a defender in our own day.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

Books in Brief

The Life of Jesus, by Conrad Noel. New York: Simon and Schuster. 638 pages. $3.75.

THE REVEREND CONRAD NOEL, grandson of an earl, educated at Wellington and Cheltenham and at Cambridge, has devoted himself to the interests of the oppressed classes in England and to emphasizing the bearing of Christianity upon the social problems of our time. He works in the slums, and preaches socialism at High Church services. During the War he flew the flag of St. George, the Sinn Fein flag and the Red flag from his church simultaneously. He is a bitter enemy of milk-and-water, overstuffed, comfortable Christianity, and must irritate his co-religionists of the Church of England most outrageously by his insistence on the radical core of Christianity and by his leanings toward Rome.

His book, the product of thirty years' effort to sum up his religion, includes a valuable section on the political, economic and religious background of Christianity which will surprise many who think that Marx was the first prophet. Then follow sections on the Kingdom of Heaven, the advent of the Messiah (which stresses the revolutionary nature of Jesus' mission), and appendices on questions which bother modernists. It is a valuable and vigorous work which should do much to persuade the irreligious that there is still life in the Church, vital, vigorous and worthy of respect.

MASON WADE

The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict, by Everett V. Stonequist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 246 pages. $1.60.

"MARGINAL MAN" is a new term for a very old phenomenon. By it Professor Stonequist means the man or woman who has been transplanted (willingly or by compulsion) from a "native" country or culture to one requiring prolonged efforts at adjustment. What happens to such migrants in various parts of the world and under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different governments is the subject of a book which, despite its purely descriptive character and its dependence upon the subjective "document" (memoirs of Jews, Negroes, "colonials," etc.), should be provocative of much fruitful discussion. The author, an American sociologist, is not deceived by the current shibboleths of "race"; he strongly emphasizes the social factor in the impact of one people upon another, and in his detailed analysis of the "hybrid" in its racial and cultural forms he develops a considerable body of hitherto unexplored material bearing on this vital topic. H. W.

Fact (August, September, October, November issues), edited by Raymond Postgate. London. $2 a year.

THE AIM of these pocket-size books is to supply the people with a cheap guide to the way social problems are being studied and handled by scientists, technicians and intellectuals. The student and the critic will appreciate them, because the material is not only dependable and up-to-date but supplies a good antidote to hazy notions and generalizations regarding social life in England. This is especially true of the September number (written by James Curtis) which, under the innocent title, "A Guide to British Liberties," describes the growing power of police and magistrates in handling strikes, suspects, etc., and supplements this with "the text of the most important recent Acts dealing with economic or political liberty." "A Pocket History of the British Worker" (August, by Raymond Postgate) is also excellent for reference and preliminary study. The November "Portrait of a Mining Town," by Philip Massey, is the beginning of an attempt to survey "typical corners of Britain . . . truthfully and penetratingly"; it is quite the most ambitious of the four books and deals not only with the financial and housing problems of the residents but with their political outlook, their leisure activities, their buying power and with everything pertinent to the giving of a really living picture. Each Fact carries a subsidiary article plus book reviews or correspondence; publication is monthly, and a year's subscription will cost United States readers $2. (19 Garrick Street, London, W. C. 2.) R. V.

New Books: A Reader's List

THEN CAME OIL, by C. B. Glasscock (Bobbs-Merrill, $3). The conquest of a frontier, the romantic lure of oil, the sudden wealth of the Indians, the fortunes made and squandered overnight, related in journalistic style by an author who admires the picturesque careers of the oil tycoons, not caring if they were based on swindles.

THE REST OF THE WORLD, by Ernest O. Hauser (Stackpole, $2). An analysis of the colonial aspirations of the Fascist powers and a catalogue of the imperial interests involved in the coming world war.

JUDGE LYNCH: His First Hundred Years, by Frank Shay (Washburn, $2.50). A dispassionate and useful record of the atrocities committed during the one hundred years of lynching, plus a brief account of its origin and a survey of the inadequate legislation that at present exists to combat it.

THE POLITICS OF MODERN SPAIN, by Frank E. Manuel (McGraw-Hill, $1.50). A stanch defender of Republican

THE OPEN ROAD

shows you more than tourist sights at least cost of time and money.

EUROPE • MEXICO • SOVIET UNION •

Small travel groups recruited from the professions—authoritative leaders assisted by cultured native guides—social contact with people of each country.

PUBLIC HOUSING in ENGLAND and SCOTLAND. Auspices National Public Housing Conference. Sailing June 29. Back August 2.

BOYS' TOUR, under leadership of **Mr. Hubert H. Nexon.** Cycling in **England** plus 10 days in **Belgium** and **Paris.** For boys 14 to 18 years old. Sailing July 2. Back August 16.

GIRLS' TOUR, under leadership of **Mrs. Edith Maltman. England, Scotland, Wales,** mostly on bicycles. For girls 14 to 18 years old. Sailing July 6. Back August 23.

PUBLIC HEALTH IN THE SOVIET UNION, under leadership of **Dr. Henry E. Sigerist.** 5 Weeks of study and observation in principal cities and health resorts. Programed with cooperation of Peoples Commissariat of Health. Sailing June 11. Back August 12.

THE SOVIET UNION and ITS DRAMATIC ARTS, under leadership of **Norris Houghton.** A month of metropolitan and folk theatre in the great cities, the **Caucasus, Soviet Armenia** and the **Crimea.** Sailing June 8. Back July 31.

MEXICO, under leadership of **Julien Bryan.** More than a month in the cities and native villages. Sailing July 14. Back August 23.

•

For rates and descriptive circulars on these and 20 other trips address:

THE OPEN ROAD

Dep't. D

8 W. 40th ST. NEW YORK

Cooperating in the Soviet Union with Intourist

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*

WINE OF CHOICE

a new comedy by S. N. BEHRMAN *with*

LESLIE BANKS · CLAUDIA MORGAN · ALEXANDER WOOLLCOTT

GUILD THEATRE 52nd STREET, WEST OF BROADWAY MATS. THURS. & SAT. 2.30. EVES. 8:30

POETRY: A Magazine of Verse

Founded in 1912 by Harriet Monroe

Every month—
the most significant new poetry and poetry criticism.

GEORGE DILLON, *Editor*
JESSICA NELSON NORTH, *Associate Editor*

$3 A YEAR

SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY OFFER:

5 Months' Trial Subscription for $1

232 East Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

LANGUAGES

SPANISH LESSONS, conversational, business and literary, at your own home. Experienced teacher, Spanish born, university graduate. Price moderate, special rate for classes. Telephone for appointment, CHelsea 3-3117, between 5:30 and 6:30.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain who is also an authority on French working-class history tells the story of the men, movements, parties and programs behind the present conflict. Well written, concise and fully documented.

THE INVASION OF CHINA BY THE WESTERN WORLD, by E. R. Hughes (Macmillan, $3.50). An admirable general account of China "under Western eyes," beginning with the sixteenth-century Jesuits and ending with the New Life movement of Chiang Kai-shek. The cultural aspects, usually overemphasized, are here balanced by the political and economic factors. The author's sympathies are strongly nationalistic.

PROBLEMS OF THE PACIFIC, 1936, edited by W. L. Holland and Kate L. Mitchell (University of Chicago Press, $5). This is the fifth issue of the Institute of Pacific Relations' invaluable reference work on Far Eastern affairs —and the first in which the Soviet Union enjoys full official representation. The last word on modern Asia.

THESE FOREIGNERS, by William Seabrook (Harcourt, Brace, $2.50). The author of "Asylum" can't swallow all the talk about "damned foreigners" and gets out into America to take a look. Straight reporting, with real names and places; an entertaining account of the Melting Pot. Good dope on Russian princes, if you're interested.

I KNOW THESE DICTATORS, by G. Ward Price (Holt, $3). Intimate glimpses of Hitler and Mussolini, highly idealized for American consumption and accompanied by a thoroughly pro-fascist analysis of world affairs.

SHAKESPEARE REDISCOVERED, by Clara Longworth de Chambrun (Scribner's, $3). I, WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, by Leslie Hotson (Oxford, $3). New evidence on the life, friends and times, leading to a better understanding of the playwright and of Elizabethan England.

Contributors

MAXWELL COHEN is a Canadian who is at present engaged in postgraduate research at the Harvard Law School. He has contributed to legal reviews and other periodicals.

KENNETH BURKE is the author of "Permanence and Change" and "Attitudes Toward History," both published in The New Republic Dollar Series.

MAURICE HINDUS has written numerous books and articles dealing with the Soviet Union. The books include "Red Bread," "Broken Earth," "The Great Offensive" and "Moscow Skies."

SOLOMON F. BLOOM, formerly a member of the staff of The New York Times, teaches Modern European History at Brooklyn College. He is at work finishing a book on Marx and nationalism.

RICHARD VAUGHAN is a young Englishman who lived for many years in South Africa.

ERNEST O. HAUSER, a member of the research staff of the Institute of Pacific Relations, is the author of "The Rest of the World," published this week by Stackpole and mentioned on page 175. He wil revisit the Far East this spring to write a series of articles for Asia.

J. G. CROWTHER is the Scientific Correspondent of The Manchester Guardian and the author of "Famous American Men of Science," "Men of Science," "Soviet Science" and other books. He is specially interested in the history and social implications of science, and is lecturing on these subjects during a tour in the United States.

MASON WADE lives in Vermont and writes reviews and critical articles for various magazines.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Harold Ward and Richard Vaughan.

PROGRESS TOURS
RECREATION PLUS EDUCATION

Travel Seminar directed by Prof. Leslie Day Zeleny, investigating conflicting educational systems and processes in ten European countries.

Social Changes Tour conducted by Dr. Clinton J. Taft, visiting ten countries —the centers of Europe's economic and social experimentation.

The New World and the Old Tour headed by Prof. Bernhard Ostrolenk, a panorama of civilizations and peoples in three continents.

Survey Tour directed by Prof. John F. Bell—a study of motives and effects of political and social forces in twelve European countries.

Mexico Seminars, five weeks of recreation and study of economic organization and revolution—educational reforms—native arts and crafts—murals, etc., under the auspices of the Workers University of Mexico and C. T. M.

Special booklets and information on each Tour

COMPASS TRAVEL BUREAU
55 W. 42nd St., N. Y. LOngacre 5-3070

ORANGES FOR SALE

TREE-RIPENED INDIAN RIVER
Oranges and Grapefruit
Direct from our grove to you
55 lb. Basket—$3.25
We pay express east of Mississippi
Satisfaction and safe arrival guaranteed
Write for price list and folder
T. R INDIAN RIVER ORANGE CO.
Cocoa, Florida
Our 11th Year — Serving 9,000 Customers

Philosophy of ART of KARL MARX
Penetrating Study of Marx's Æsthetics
By MIKHAIL LIFSHITZ
Also: Plekhanov's ART & SOCIETY; Marxist analyses of Balzac, Ibsen, Shakespeare.
96 pp. 35 cents 3 for $1
CRITICS GROUP, 96 5th Ave., New York

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS

SKIP THIS AD if you let others do your thinking for you. CONTACTS provides a haven for the intelligent minority only. Details—3-cent stamp. Box 91, Station D, New York City.

HAPPINESS CIRCLE, the best anodyne for the lack of camaraderie. Enclose stamped envelope for details. Dept. W, Box 107, Grand Central Annex, New York.

POSITION WANTED

MATURE WOMAN with doctor's degree, having wide and varied experience in the educational field, industrial relations and vocational guidance desires temporary work (6 months). Would serve as companion-tutor to children in the home or traveling-consultant or teacher in progressive school or camp. Highest references. Address: Box 58, The New Republic.

FOR SALE

12 ACRES OF LAKE PROPERTY in northern New Jersey, suitable for country home or development; 30 miles from New York City, will sell cheap to cash buyer. Address, Box 59, The New Republic.

LECTURE

"GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND THE WORLD SITUATION." lecture by Max Bedacht, Saturday, March 12th, 2:30 P. M., at the Workers School, 35 E. 12th Street, 2nd floor. Admission, 25 cents.

FOR RENT

CLIP THIS AD—Farm house, four fireplaces, running water, surrounded by fields and woods, swimming and tennis on property. Commuting. Rent $300. May—Labor Day. Inquire Angell, 126 Bank Street, New York City, about Story Book Farm, Califon, N. J.

TEACHERS

New Republic readers rank first in the University of Kansas tests in Public Intelligence.

The New Republic ranks first in the University of Ohio test of quality of magazines.

The New Republic is the magazine for classroom use in English, Politics, History and Economics. Rate: 25 cents a month per student, for orders of ten or more copies to one address.

Copies of The New Republic's supplement "The Depression" are ten cents; in quantities of 20 or more, seven cents.

The NEW REPUBLIC
40 E. 49 St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED